hereby granted to the State of South Dakota for such purpose, and in case any of said sections, or parts thereof, are lost to said State by reason of allotments thereof to any Indian or Indians, or otherwise, the governor of said State, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, is hereby authorized, within the area described in section 1 of this act or within the said Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, to locate other lands not otherwise appropriated, not exceeding two sections in any one township, which shall be paid for by the United States as herein provided, in quantity equal to the loss, and such selections shall be made prior to the opening of such lands to settlement."

That section 8 of an act entitled "An act to authorize the sale and disposition of a portion of the surplus and unallotted lands in Mellette and Washabaugh Counties in the Rosebud Indian Reservation in the State of South Dakota, and making appropriation and provision to carry the same into effect," approved May 30, 1910, is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. That sections 16 and 36 of the land in each township within the tract described in section 1 of this act shall not be subject to entry, but shall be reserved for the use of the common schools and paid for by the United States at \$2.50 per acre, and the same are hereby granted to the State of South Dakota for such purpose, and in case any of said sections or parts thereof are lost to said State by reason of allotments thereof to any Indian or Indians, or otherwise, the governor of said State, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, is hereby authorized, within the area described in section 1 of this act or within the said Rosebud Indian Reservation, to locate other lands not otherwise appropriated, not exceeding two sections in any one township, which shall be paid for by the United States as herein provided, in quantity equal to the loss, and such selections shall be made prior to the opening of such lands to settlement."

That the time in which the c

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 21, under the head of "Utah," at the top of page 38, to insert:

For the maintenance, purchase of seed, farm implements, and stock for the Indians of Skull Valley, Deep Creek, and other detached Indians in Utah, \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be immediately available and expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 6, to insert: For continuing the construction of lateral distributing systems and the maintenance of existing irrigation systems to irrigate the allotted lands of the Uncompangre, Ulntah, and White River Utes, in Utah, authorized under the act of June 21, 1906, to be expended under the terms thereof and reimbursable as therein provided, \$75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

There is hereby granted to the State of Utah upon the terms and conditions hereinafter named the following-described property, known as the Indian school, lot 4, block 50, Randlett town site, former Uintah Indian Reservation, including the land, buildings, and fixtures pertaining to said school: Provided, That said land and buildings shall be held and maintained by the State of Utah as an institution of learning, and that Indian pupils may at all times be admitted to such school free of charge for tuition and on terms of equality with white pupils: Provided further, That this grant shall be effective at any time before July 1, 1911, if before that date the governor of Utah fles an acceptance thereof with the Secretary of the Interior accepting for said State said property, upon the terms and conditions herein prescribed. The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 13, to insert: prescribed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 23, under the head of "Washington," on page 40, line 8, after the word "dollars," to insert: "Provided, That the amount hereby appropriated, and all moneys heretofore or hereafter to be appropriated, for this project shall be repaid into the Treasury of the United States in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 1, 1907; so as to make the clause read:

For extension and maintenance of the irrigation system on lands allotted to Yakima Indians in Washington, \$15,000: Provided, That the amount hereby appropriated, and all moneys heretofore or hereafter to be appropriated, for this project shall be repaid into the Treasury of the United States in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 1,

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, after line 2, to insert:

The next amendment was, on page 41, after line 2, to insert:

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to sell and convey the lands, buildings, and other appurtenances of the old Fort Spokane Military Reservation, now used for Indian school purposes, and adjoining the Colville Reservation, in the State of Washington, containing approximately 640 acres, and to use the proceeds thereof in the establishment and maintenance of such new schools and administration of affairs as may be required by the Colville and Spokane Indians in sald State: Provided, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized in his discretion to reserve from sale or other disposition any part of said reservation chiefly valuable for power sites and reservoir sites and land valuable for minerals: Provided further, That in the case of land reserved on account of minerals, the Secretary of the Interior may sell the surface under such regulations as he may prescribe: Provided further, That, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, the surface of the lands may be sold separate from any minerals that may be found thereunder. The Secretary of the Interior, the surface of the lands may be sold separate from any minerals that may be found thereunder. The Secretary of the Interior shall report to Congress at its next session his action in the premises.

The amendment was agreed to,

Mr. CLAPP. It will be impossible to conclude the bill this evening, and the committee has an amendment to offer in which the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. Heyburn] is interested. He can not be here to-morrow. I therefore ask the Senate to return to page 12.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection the Senate will

return to page 12.

Mr. CLAPP. On page 12, after line 14, I move to insert what I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The Secretary. On page 12, after line 14, it is proposed to insert the following:

The Secretarry. On page 12, after line 14, it is proposed to insert the following:

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to cause allotments to be made of the lands on the Fort Hall Indian Reservation in Idaho in areas as follows: To each head of a family whose consort is dead, 40 acres of irrigable land and 320 acres of grazing land, and to each other Indian belonging on the reservation or having rights thereon, 20 acres of irrigable land and 160 acres of grazing land.

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to set aside and reserve so much of the timber land of the Fort Hall Reservation as he may deem necessary to provide timber for the domestic use of the Indians, not exceeding in aggregate two townships of land; and the said Secretary is hereby authorized to set aside and reserve such lands as may be necessary for agency, school, and religious purposes, not exceeding in aggregate 1,280 acres of land for agency and school purposes and 160 acres for any one religious society, to remain reserved so long as agency, school, or religious institutions are maintained thereon; and the said Secretary is hereby authorized to set aside and reserve certain lands chiefly valuable for the stone quarries under the provisions of section 3 of the act of February 28, 1891, Twenty-sixth United States Statutes at Large, page 795, or, in his discretion, to operate said quarries for the benefit of the Indians of the Fort Hall Reservation and to sell the stone quarried therefrom, the proceeds derived from said quarries to be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of said Indians and expended for their benefit in such manner as the said Secretary may prescribe.

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized in his discretion to make allotments as herein provided within the "Fort Hall Bottoms" grazing reserve to those Indians who have occupied and erected valuable improvements on tracts therein.

All acts or parts of acts in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLAPP. Unless some Senator desires an executive session, I will move that the Senate adjourn. I make that motion. The motion was agreed to, and (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 25, 1911, at 12 o'clock meridian.

### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Tuesday, January 24, 1911.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by Rabbi Alfred G. Moses, of Mobile, Ala.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

BANKING AND CURRENCY.

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the banking and currency question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The

Chair hears none.

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit herewith, as a part of my remarks, a communication addressed to me by my friend of many years, Mr. R. C. Milliken. He has given a great amount of study and research to the question of bank-ing and currency, and I feel sure his article will be appreciated by all thoughtful students of the question. I commend it to the careful perusal of all. I am not in accord with all he proposes in his plan, nor with all his criticism of the Aldrich plan. I believe it will be exceedingly unwise for us to undertake to establish one central bank or institution for all our country. But if the United States could be divided into groups of States, according to the community of interests of the respective groups, and such an institution as the Bank of France or that of Germany, modified to suit our conditions, were to be established in each group, with power to establish branches and fix the rate of discount and deal directly with the mer-chants, farmers, and manufacturers, then I think we would have a banking system that would at the same time serve and protect the commerce of the country and not the banks only. I do not wish now to make any extended remarks.

But I do wish to say that in my opinion this Congress ought to take up this question immediately and settle it. If we do not, it will be held in abeyance until the tariff question and others are fully thrashed out, which will not be probably for the next 10 years. There is less partisan politics involved in the settlement of this question now than will be again for many years, in my opinion. Every thoughtful man must see that it can never be settled right in the heat of partisan politics. The commerce of this country needs protection. Congress must set-tle the question in the end, and why not do so now?

Mr. Milliken's communication follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 23, 1911.

Hon. O. W. GILLESPIE,

Member House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Member House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I would respectfully direct attention to the financial plan presented to the National Monetary Commission by its distinguished chairman, Hon. Nelson W. Aldrich, and beg leave to point out those defects which appear to me to be the worst and recommend such a plan as I believe will meet the requirements necessary to cure our present financial ills.

Before attempting to criticize the aforementioned plan or showing the necessity for a head to our credit system I beg your indulgence in stating a few fundamental propositions. Therefore, for convenience sake, I shall divide my subject into three parts, viz:

I. Money; its definition and relationship to credit.

II. Currency (current credit) and its instrumentality.

III. The banking system.

Part I. Money.

PART I. MONEY.

PART I. Money.

Money is anything of value—a value in itself and aside from its use as money—customarily used in trade as a medium of exchange and measure of values.

Almost every really valuable article of commerce has at some time or other been customarily used as money in some country or other; but gold and silver have been most generally used for that purpose among commercial people. Congress in 1834 made the silver doliar the unit or measure of value and declared the ratio between those metals to be 15.98 to 1. Such declaration being slightly at variance with the truth—I. e., silver being then slightly more valuable than gold at that ratio—the gold dollar was made the unit. But when California, in 1851, produced the unprecedented amount of \$99,000,000 gold the metal in a silver dollar became worth \$1.07. In consequence of such depreciation in the value of gold, all our silver coins were melted, thus leaving us with no change money. So Congress passed the act of February 21, 1853, coining all subsidiary silver pleces on Government account and putting 8 per cent less metal in them than the amount contained in the silver dollar.

As the bimetallic declaration of 1834 was a failure for the reason stated, Congress, in 1873, enacted section 3511 (Rev. Stats.) making our present dollar containing 23.22 grains gold the unit of measure of value. It is the 23.22 grains of gold contained in that coin, rather than the stamp upon it, which makes it the measure of value, for section 3584 expressly provides that while the stamp shall be indisputable evidence as to the quality of the metal therein contained, yet it is only prima facie evidence as to the quantity. That is good law; good finance, and good money, the only money we have, all other being credit or promises to pay money. In the case of the silver dollar the holder lugs a collateral employed, yet each passes current with the other and with gold coin because of the holder's confidence in the financial ability and good faith of the Government to maintain the parit

PART II. CURRENCY.

Part II. Currency.

Part II. Currency.

We must not confuse the currency principle with its Instrumentality—the banking system. The former may be scientific and sound and the banking system bad, and vice versa. A bank-note currency may be divided into two classes—secured and unsecured. In effect there is no difference between a secured bank-note currency and paper money issued by Government authority, both being inflexible and unresponsive to the demands of trade. They inflate credit, being an attempt to create money out of paper instead of coining it out of gold, an authority delegated by the Constitution to Congress alone. Mr. Charles A. Conant, in his history of the modern banks of issue, has defined so clearly the meaning and province of a bank note that we shall quote him. He says:

"Bank notes are not money but are a form of credit of substantially the same nature as bills of exchange, promissory notes, and checks. They are the proper instruments of commercial transactions, because they are the creatures of commercial needs and are adapted in volume to the commercial necessities. In this respect they differ from Government paper money, which is regulated wholly by the necessities of Governments and not by the convenience of trade. Bank notes are not, as Government paper money usually is, pieces of paper created out of nothing to represent value. They are simply the paper representatives of a great mass of commercial transactions."

PART III, THE BANKING SYSTEM.

It is hardly necessary for us to state the necessity for a central bank of issue, as nearly every Government has one. The greatest need for such an institution is to furnish our Federal Government and our States and their subsidiary governments with a sound fiscal agent, and at the same time take our 25,000 banks out of politics. The principal thing to be considered is as to the

MANNER OF CONTROL OF A CENTRAL BANK.

The control should be lodged in three separate and independent bodies, viz:

1. Governor with a veto power.
2. Directors empowered to legislate, etc.
3. Censors with the power to inspect.

GOVERNOR OR EXECUTIVE.

Let the President of the United States select the governor from three names submitted to him by the Secretary of the Treasury. The latter to choose from citizens owning \$20,000 of the bank stock for one year before such selection occurs. Make the governor the chief executive officer of the bank and subject to its by-laws, with authority to yeto

a new by-law. Authorize him to appoint the managers, agents, and other representatives of the bank, subject to the approval of the board of regents, except the deputy governor, directors, censors, and such inspectors as the board of directors may appoint. The deputy governor should be selected in the same manner as and possess the qualifications required of the governor, except that he should own not less than \$15.000 of the central bank's stock, be elected for a term of 10 years, and act as governor during the absence or inability of the governor to serve. Let the President of the United States remove the governor for cause.

DIRECTORS.

Have 49 directors—one for each State, the two Territories, and District of Columbia. Divide them into 5 classes of 10 members each, except 1 of 9, and elect them by the ballots of the electors residing in their respective States. Elect the members of one class annually for a term of 5 years. Let the members of the first board hold office for terms of 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 years, respectively, and be chosen from among the merchants and manufacturers of the highest standing and commercial rating in their respective States who will qualify with \$10,000 of the stock. Require each director to own stock in the central bank in the amount of \$10,000, and prohibit him from owning stock in any other bank or concern buying or selling stocks or bonds; also require him to be and remain a resident of the State from which he is elected during his term of office, and prohibit him from holding office with any Government, State or Federal, or any political party. Empower the board of directors to legislate for the central bank by by-laws; appoint a board of regents composed of nine persons and such inspectors as they choose and designate the districts from which the censors are to be elected. Give each member of the board of directors a vote on the board in proportion to the central-bank stock owned in his State and the deposits placed with or under the control of the central bank by his State and its subsidiary governments the previous year, but require 30 per cent of the members of the board of directors to pass any measure.

N. B.—Vou will observe I have given the State denosits equal repre-

measure.

N. B.—You will observe I have given the State deposits equal representation with the stock in the election of the legislative body, but no voice in control. This is done as an inducement for the States to make the central bank their fiscal agent.

ELECTORS.

Define an elector as a citizen owning and possessing \$2,500 of the central-bank stock in good faith and for his own use and benefit for 5 years before the date of the election at which he is to vote, provided that in the election of censors for the first 5 years of the bank's existence such time limit shall not apply.

BOARD OF REGENTS, OR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

BOARD OF RECENTS, OR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

A regent should be a citizen owning \$10,000 of the central-bank stock, and the members of the board of regents, consisting of 9 persons, should be selected from the following occupations in the proportion herein set forth, viz, 2 merchants, 2 manufacturers, 2 commercial bankers, 1 agriculturist, 1 teacher or writer on finance, and 1 lawyer. Prohibit the regents, except the 2 bankers, from owning stock in any other banking institution or concern purchasing or selling stocks or bonds. Empower the board of regents to execute the will of the board of directors as expressed in the by-laws. In other words, let this board act in a similar capacity to that of an executive committee.

CENSORS.

CENSORS.

The board of censors should consist of three public certified accountants, elected for one year each, but four months apart, by the ballots of the electors of their respective censor's districts. Define a censor's district as a city with 100,000 population. Permit no two censors serving the bank at one time to be residents of the same State or within 300 miles of one another. Empower the censors to supervise the elections, inspect the properties, and transactions of the bank, and verify the statements of its officers.

PROFESSIONAL CENSORS SUPERIOR TO GOVERNMENT EXAMINERS.

PROFESSIONAL CENSORS SUPERIOR TO GOVERNMENT EXAMINEES.

A professional public accountant, elected in a practical manner by responsible and interested financial backers not in control of the bank is far superior to Government examiners, because he is pursuing his regular profession, that of public accounting, and therefore has a professional reputation to sustain; whereas Government examiners have no professions of their own, being mere clerks, most of whom seek that position as a stepping stone to some lucrative bank office they may not be fitted for. Consequently the latter employ the soft pedal and permit gross errors to go unpublished, which the professional accountant would criticise. Professional accountants, elected by the minority out of control, are universally used by the British life-insurance companies, for that Government will not expend one penny to ascertain if those in control are abusing their trust. They are employed by the Bank of England and most of the Canadian banks, neither of which Governments inspect those institutions.

THIS IS COMPOSITE MANNER OF BANKS OF ENGLAND AND FRANCE CONTROL. THIS IS COMPOSITE MANNER OF BANKS OF ENGLAND AND FRANCE CONTROL.

In the qualification and manner of election of the governor and the powers he is to exercise we have followed the method provided by the charter of the Bank of France. In the qualification and manner of electing the directors and electors we have followed the plan of the Bank of England; except, in order to make it practical for our country, we have provided for the election of directors severally by States, for it would be out of the question to expect the business men of Texas to vote intelligently for persons residing in the adjoining State of Arkansas. The division of the powers and checks imposed against each class, executive and legislative, are principles taken from the laws and practices of both the above-mentioned central banks and many other great public-service corporations of Europe. The American method of mingling the powers and duties of the executive and directing bodies of our great public-service corporations is bad and has led to czarism in control and caused a distrust which should not exist.

DISPOSITION OF CENTRAL-BANK PROFITS.

DISPOSITION OF CENTRAL-BANK PROFITS.

The dividends to stockholders should be limited to, say, 6 per cent until a considerable surplus is accumulated, then divide the profits as follows, one-fourth to stockholders; one-fourth to such mutual societies and corporations using the central bank as their fiscal agent, in proportion to their deposits with it; and the balance to the States using it as their fiscal agent, in proportion to their deposits with or placed under its control. The Federal Government can well afford to make this concession to the States in order to take them out of the banking business and the banks out of politics, for the central bank can fully compensate the Federal Government in service for every dollar it deposits with the bank.

POWERS OF CENTRAL BANK.

The bank should be empowered to purchase and sell gold coin and bullion, make loans, and discount paper not exceeding three months in time bearing two solvent signatures or one solvent signature and ample collateral, the loan not to exceed three-fourths the market value of the collateral, issue currency payable on demand in gold and establish agencies for its redemption, do a general banking business, appoint agents, and establish branches. All agents and agency contracts should be subject to the by-laws enacted at the time and to be enacted thereafter, and if such agency contract carries with it the right to countersign and issue the notes of the central bank, the other bank holding such contract should have at least \$1,000,000 paid capital and agree to allow the central bank to appoint a representative to be and remain at its office and hold one key to the vault containing the reserves or portfolio behind the notes issued by such agent and to see that it respected the terms of such contract. It should be empowered also to purchase or make loans on treasury bills of both classes of American Governments, State and Federal, and to act as their fiscal agent in issuing, floating, or refunding their debts.

What the bank charter should not contain.

WHAT THE BANK CHARTER SHOULD NOT CONTAIN.

The charter should be silent on the bank's reserves, the amount of its note issue, and government inspection. Neither should its notes be taxed nor made a legal tender in the payment of debts.

ARGUMENT AS TO NONTENDER QUALITY OF BANK NOTES

ARGUMENT AS TO NONTENDER QUALITY OF BANK NOTES.

The Scotch and Canadian bank notes have never been a legal tender and have always passed current with coin, because of the confidence of their holders in those institutions to redeem them on demand in coin, During the first century's existence of the Bank of England its notes were not a legal tender and passed current with coin; but the British Government, in 1797, forced the bank to make it a \$5,000,000 gold loan with which to wage war, and in order to compensate the bank therefor, the ministry had Parliament make its uncovered notes a legal tender. Immediately those notes fell below par and remained below par for many years thereafter. At the same time the Scotch banks were tendered such paternalistic aid, a favor which they promptly declined, and their notes passed current with coin during the whole of Napoleon's wars. The German Reichbank notes were not a legal tender until 1909 and they were never below par. Nor is a Bank of England note now a legal tender at the bank.

CENTRAL BANK NEEDED IN MOSILIZING TEMPORARY INVESTMENTS.

CENTRAL BANK NEEDED IN MOBILIZING TEMPORARY INVESTMENTS.

CENTRAL BANK NEEDED IN MOBILIZING TEMPORARY INVESTMENTS.

There are several reasons why the domestic bill of exchange is not in general use here. Among which we might enumerate: First, our lack of a central bank of issue to which the holders of such bills may go to have them converted into a more liquid credit. Second, because our country is so large that our business men do not know each other's financial standing as do those of European countries. Third, because of the desire of those who must become the natural drawers of our domestic bills to be relieved of the obligation, as soon as possible and thus avoid the financial risk involved and cost of maintaining an expensive credit department.

LLUSTRATION OF CAUSE FOR NONUSE OF DOMESTIC BLL, HERE.

ILLUSTRATION OF CAUSE FOR NONUSE OF DOMESTIC BILL HERE

thus avoid the financial risk involved and cost of maintaining an expensive credit department.

ILLUSTRATION OF CAUSE FOR NONUSE OF DOMESTIC BILL HERE.

For instance, the wholesale merchant in St. Louis sells a bill of merchandise to a retailer in Laredo, Tex., and in order to have the latter do business on a cash basis the wholesaler offers him a high rate of discount which the retailer must take advantage of to protect his future credit. The wholesaler calculates that his losses on discounts under his present custom would be less than his losses on discounts under his present custom would be less than his losses on discounts under his present custom would be less than his losses on bad debts should he adopt the custom of drawing drafts maturing after his customers had disposed of their purchases of him. The retailer, therefore, must obtain credit from his local bank, employing two credit instruments, i. e., his own promissory note with which to procure currency, or more probably St. Louis or New York exchange. In Europe that transaction would be conducted with one credit instrument, the wholesaler and retailer joining their credit in a two or three month bill of exchange. The wholesaler would take it to his private bank and discount it at a low rate. If the bank should need cash at any time, and the bill market at its home, say Berlin, be unfavorable, it would sell the bill in a more favorable market, say Paris. The Paris banker might sell it in London or Berlin before maturity. During any period of that bill's existence any of the banks holding it could take it to any European central bank of issue and obtain gold or bank notes for it provided the names on it are those accepted by the central issue banks for discount. This enables the European private banks to do business on extremely low cash reserves, thus economizing their capital. If a bill possess two signatures of unquestioned financial responsibility, it is known as a prime bill. We use the bank note as cash, while Europeans use the bill of exchange f

MANNER OF ALDRICH CENTRAL BANK CONTROL

MANNER OF ALDRICH CENTRAL RANK CONTROL.

The corporate powers of this central bank are placed in the board of directors, consisting of 45 persons, a majority of whom are elected by the national banks owning stock in the central bank. Each national bank must subscribe for stock in the central bank to the extent of 20 per cent of its own stock, one-half to be paid for. This gives the national banks ten times the interest in the success of themselves that they have in the central bank. Considering that the dividends on the central-bank stock are limited to 5 per cent and those on their national-bank stock are unlimited, the ratio between those interests will probably be 30 to 1. Therefore, the central bank will be controlled as a "feeder" to the national banks in precisely the same manner that the great life-insurance companies of this country are feeders to the banks and

promoting companies controlling them. The principal business of all European central banks is with the other banks doing a commercial business. The charters of all European central banks prohibit those in control from owning stock in any other banking institution and require them to own a certain amount of stock in the central bank to give them a personal interest in its success and responsibility for losses. The Aldrich central bank will be the only stock-controlled central bank in the world and the only one where those in actual control have no direct personal interest in its success independently of any other financial institution.

EXECUTIVE OR GOVERNOR OF ALDRICH BANK.

It may be contended by the uninformed that the governor, who is to be selected by the President of the United States, will counteract any undue influence by reason of such diverse and antagonistic interests of those on the board of directors. Not so, because the President is limited in his selection to the list of names furnished him by the board of directors, and the governor is made subject to the by-laws which are to be enacted by the board. He can not appoint a branch manager except on the approval of the executive committee, a body composed of nine persons, of whom five (majority) are elected by the board. Therefore the governor can exercise no independent power nor impose an effective check on the will of the members of the board.

EX OFFICIO MINORITY REPRESENTATION ON THE BOARD.

EX OFFICIO MINORITY REPRESENTATION ON THE BOARD.

EX OFFICIO MINORITY REPRESENTATION ON THE BOARD.

The board will possess six ex officio members selected by the President of the United States, among whom will be the Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of Commerce and Labor, and the Comptroller of the Currency, who will be in a woeful minority; besides, the three public officials mentioned have quite enough of governmental duties to perform to occupy their time fully. It is a mistake to put a Government official on the board of a corporation, especially so when he is in the minority. That was done by the charter of the second United States bank, and by reason of bad management it became insolvent before it was three years old and would have been placed in a receiver's hands had not the Government come to its rescue. The charter of the Illinois Central Railroad provides that the governor of that State shall be an ex officio member of that board, and all of us have read within the past year about its scandal, involving embezzlements aggregating several million dollars. We could cite many instances of similar wrongdoings by corporations where high Government officials were ex officio members of the boards.

WHY AND HOW PRESIDENT SHOULD SELECT THE HEAD.

WHY AND HOW PRESIDENT SHOULD SELECT THE HEAD.

WHY AND HOW PRESIDENT SHOULD SELECT THE HEAD.

The President should select the chief executive officer of such an important financial institution, not so much because of a distrust in the private capital backing the institution, but more as a matter of right to the Government he represents and which will be its largest depositor and customer. But in making that selection the President should seek those personally interested in its financial success, and the best evidence of that fact is that the person so selected owns stock in it. Such a person will be responsible for losses resulting from bad management.

As the private capital is responsible for any financial loss to the Covernment.

Such a person will be responsible for losses resulting from bad management.

As the private capital is responsible for any financial loss to the Government and other creditors, give the executive officer selected by the President only a veto power on the board representing the private capital, and vice versa. This will afford ample protection to all interests, public and private. There will be no conflict of authority and no trouble to locate responsibility. This method of corporate control was first adopted by the Scotch, and has been made the policy of other countries. The French Parliament looked on this method with such favor that in 1863 and 1867 it was applied to most French corporations, thus ridding those corporations from the unwise restrictions imposed by French laws. We should adopt this in planning the control of our central bank, so as to teach our people what it means, that we may have more freedom from legislative restraint in corporate management. If the Aldrich plan did not provide for a control which is diametrically opposed to this common-sense method, it would not be necessary for the charter of that institution to contain the numerous restrictions it does, many of which are opposed to reason, against the testimony of the great experts interviewed by the National Monetary Commission and without precedent anywhere.

ALDRICH PLAN INCOMPLETE FINANCIAL REMEDY.

ALDRICH PLAN INCOMPLETE FINANCIAL REMEDY.

ALDRICH PLAN INCOMPLETE FINANCIAL REMEDY.

The Aldrich plan is incomplete in that it makes no provision for the ultimate retirement of our greenbacks and other unfunded debt of the Government. That should be declared to be the financial policy of this Government, and the Secretary of the Treasury clothed with authority to carry it into effect without disturbance to the money market. Nothing short of that will place us on a sound financial basis.

RESERVES BEHIND NOTE ISSUE UNDER ALDRICH PLAN UNSAFE.

RESERVES BEHIND NOTE ISSUE UNDER ALDRICH PLAN UNSAFE.

The plan provides that the central bank shall hold in gold or other lawful money 33\(\frac{1}{2}\) per cent of its outstanding note issue. A fixed legal reserve is the most dangerous fault of our present national banking system. The best financial experts have pronounced it unwise and unsafe. Germany is the only European country requiring it, and their Reichbank has a reserve of only 40.1 per cent to 75.3 per cent for the Bank of France, an institution operating without any reserve requirement. The true test of solvency of an issue bank is not the amount of cash it holds, but the character of its portfolio. The Monte de Piedad of Mexico held \$2,480,000 in cash against a circulation of \$4,237,000 (57 per cent) when the report went out that it held too many long-time investments, causing the run which forced it to suspend specie payments. If the Bank of Germany had a "bank parliamentary body" it would not be necessary for the Government Parliament to Impose such restrictions.

LEGAL BURDENS IMPOSED ON ALDRICH BANK DANGEROUS

The plan provides that the central bank must, for a period of one year, offer to purchase at par the 2 per cent bonds held by all the national banks subscribing to the central bank stock. For an old and well established commercial bank of unquestioned credit to assume such a burden would, in my opinion, be dangerous, but for a newly organized issue bank to do it would be folly, and might result in financial disaster to the whole country. Therefore we suggest that that burden rest where it is at present, on the national banks which have a combined capital and surplus exceeding \$1,500,000,000. If we read the motive of the plan aright, this is the cudgel which is to force all the national banks to buy stock in the new institution, for the act expressly provides that the central bank shall enjoy the privilege of having those 2's refunded by the Government at a higher rate of interest. Destroy the circulation privilege now enjoyed by our 2's and they would go to a strictly revenue-producing basis, 80 per cent or lower. Rather than suffer a loss of from 20 per cent to 25 per cent on the 2's such control bank, but it will be at the risk of financial disaster to the counciliance of the council bank, but it will be at the risk of financial disaster to the counciliance of the

try. It would be safer to give those banks the right of such re-funding privilege, provided they invest in the stock of the new bank and permit the Secretary of the Treasury to call in the notes of such as he chose for retirement. That would accomplish the same object and be much

ALDRICH PLAN OF TAXING NOTES A MISTAKE

The plan provides that the central bank may issue untaxed notes to the amount of the present outstanding issue of national-bank notes, and for all notes above that amount a tax ranging from 3 per cent to 6 per cent is imposed. Again, the German law is adopted, a purely arbitrary and unscientific law enacted by a parliament of nonexperts. Those experts who have been forced to operate under that law declare it to be wrong in principle, and asserted to the members of the National Monetary Commission, who took their testimony, they believed it would be repealed. Why take the testimony of experts if we are going to ignore their advice? The French Parliament limits the amount of the notes the Bank of France may issue, but that law is constantly amended, so that the bank has never come within one billion francs of the legal limit, and the last statement we had it was more than two billion below such limit. Why have such a law? The Aldrich plan is right in not prescribing a limit to the note issue. Prof. Andre Liesse, the great French financial expert and author of The Evolution of Credit and Banks in France, says such limitation imposed on the Bank of France's note issue is wrong and does no good.

ALDRICH PLAN OVERCAPITALIZED.

The capital authorized under this plan is excessive for a new lasti-

ALDRICH PLAN OVERCAPITALIZED.

The capital authorized under this plan is excessive for a new institution and could not be raised without the use of such force provided by the act. The authorized capital of such an institution should not exceed \$150,000,000. It should begin business with a small capital, say, \$5,000,000 or \$10,000,000, and increase it from time to time as the business of the bank increases. Empower the Secretary of the Treasury to demand such increase as he believes is needed. At the beginning the central bank should make some strong and well controlled commercial bank in each of our cities its agent to discount commercial paper under proper safeguards. Have such agents countersign and guarantee the payment of all notes countersigned by it. That would be inexpensive and afford ample protection to all concerned.

LOCATION OF ALDRICH BANK MISTAKE

We believe that the head or executive office of the central bank should be located at New York, the financial center of the country. If the manner of its control be as outlined heretofore by me, there should be no prejudice against that great city.

Very respectfully, yours,

R. C. MILLIKEN.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Post Office appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 31539) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, and for other purposes, with Mr. Stevens of Minnesota in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment that was pending at the time the committee rose on yesterday.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the paragraph to which the point of order was raised.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of letter carriers, substitutes for carriers on annual leave, clerks in charge of substations, and tolls and ferriage, Rural Delivery Service, \$38,790,000: Provided, That not to exceed \$20,000 of the amount hereby appropriated may be used for compensation of clerks in charge of substations: Provided further, That in the discretion of the Postmaster General the pay of the carrier on the water route on Lake Winnepesaukee who furnishes his own power boat for mail service during the summer months may be fixed at an amount not exceeding \$900 in any one calendar year.

The CHAIRMAN. To this the gentleman from Ulinois IM.

The CHAIRMAN. To this the gentleman from Illinois | Mr. MANN] made the point of order. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts desire to be heard upon the point of order?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I understood the amendment was to be read for information.

The CHAIRMAN. Subsequently an amendment was submitted, to be read for information, by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

Mr. MANN. And I suppose he desires to be heard on it. The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois insist upon his point of order?

Mr. MANN. I reserved the point of order. I understood the gentleman wished to be heard on the proposition that he submitted.

Mr. LEVER. As I understood it, the gentleman from Illinois made the point of order against the paragraph, and not against

the amendment which I offered.

Mr. MANN. I reserved the point of order. If I had made the point of order, the gentleman's amendment might never be offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is not upon the proposed amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina, but to the paragraph of the bill.

Is the point of order reserved to the Mr. SULLOWAY. whole paragraph, may I ask?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order was reserved to the paragraph that was first read by the Clerk, on page 30. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mann] insist on his point of order on the paragraph on page 30 of the bill as read by the Clerk?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order on the paragraph, and asks me to make a statement as to my amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mann] only reserved a point of order against the paragraph and not against the gentleman's amendment

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so understands. The question before the committee is against the paragraph on page 30 as read by the Clerk. A point of order was reserved by the gentleman from Illinois against the proviso.

Mr. MANN. I reserved a point of order on the paragraph. The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist on his point of order?

Mr. MANN. I understood the gentleman from South Carolina wanted me to reserve the point of order in order that he might be heard.

Mr. LEVER. That is true, Mr. Chairman, and I have been trying to get the attention of the Chair in order that I may make a statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I desire to offer, and which was inserted in the RECORD for information, reads as follows:

Amend by inserting, in line 16, on page 30, after the word "dollars,"

Amend by inserting, in line 10, on page 50, the following:

"Provided, That no part of the foregoing sum shall be used in the payment of the salary of any rural carrier where such salary is less than \$1,200 per year on a route of maximum length, and on a shorter route where the salary is less than proportional to that paid for a route of maximum length."

Mr. Chairman, as to the point of order on that proposition-

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the situation,

debate is proceeding by unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly. That is the proper understanding.

Mr. LEVER. The purpose of this amendment, Mr. Chairman, is to provide an increase in the salary of rural carriers. The effect of the amendment will be to hold up the appropriation for all rural delivery service unless legislation is enacted by Congress providing an increase in salaries for rural carriers. I am well aware of what the effect will be. The law now provides salaries for rural carriers. My amendment will have the effect of changing the existing law by forcing the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads to bring in a bill making the salaries of rural carriers conform to the amendment that I am offering. It is my understanding that there are, perhaps, not hundreds, but dozens, of bills before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads providing for increases in the salaries of rural carriers.

Mr. WEEKS. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. LEVER. I will.
Mr. WEEKS. It is possible there are such bills, but those who have introduced the bills have not taken the trouble to call them up in the committee this year.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, it is no excuse to say that gentlemen have not gone before the Post Office Committee and urged the passage of their bills. As for myself, personally, I do not happen to be the author of one of those bills. It is the duty of the Post Office Committee to consider all propositions before it upon their merits and not upon the pressure brought to bear upon the committee. If these propositions are meritorious within themselves, they ought to be reported to the House. If they are not meritorious, some action ought to be had saying so. Certainly the Post Office Committee will not escape responsibility by the contention that Members have not pressed this legislation, the fact being that they have urged it. The purpose of my amendment is to declare the sense of this Congress as to its position with reference to rural carriers' salaries. I take it that if the House shall pass this amendment-and I am satisfied it is not subject to a point of order-it seems to me that it will be direction to the Post Office Committee to act in conformity with the provisions of the amendment and bring in a bill providing for legislation which will make the salaries of rural carriers such as is provided in the amendment. Either that or the Post Office Committee will take upon itself the responsibility of absolutely holding up every rural delivery route in this country. I am confident in my own mind that the vast majority of the membership of this House believes in a substantial increase in the salaries of rural carriers, because

I take it that the vast majority of the membership of this House appreciates the hardships of these very faithful servants of the

I am satisfied that the majority of us appreciate the fact that the rural carrier ought to be placed in point of salary upon a plane of equality with the city carrier, and I am confident that the sense of justice of this House will make the House almost unanimous in favor of legislation bringing about such a result as that. My amendment is offered for the purpose of getting the sense of this body upon that proposition. [Applause.]

The present salary of a rural carrier for a maximum route—one 24 miles in length—is \$900, and for a shorter route in proportion. This amendment seeks to increase the salary to \$1,200 for a maximum route and a proportional increase for shorter routes. This places the rural carrier somewhat on an equality with the city carrier as far as salary is concerned. The maximum salary of a city carrier is \$1,200, and, in addition to this, if he uses a vehicle in the performance of his duty, receives an allowance averaging approximately \$275 for the maintenance of his equipment, thus giving a salary of nearly

Both city and rural carriers do splendid service, and their compensation should be in proportion to their service and in keeping with the increase in cost of living everywhere. The rural carrier must not be overlooked. He is a most deserving and hard-working employee of the Government, and as such is

entified to a fair and decent salary.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unani-

mous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I desire to have read an amendment which I propose to offer on this

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out in lines 14 and 15, page 30, the words "thirty-eight million seven hundred and ninety thousand" and insert "forty-two million eight hundred and eighty-seven thousand."

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I offer it to be read for information, and the gentleman can reserve his point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman

from Georgia had that read for information.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Now, on this general subject, that amendment I offer is to increase the salary of the rural carriers \$100 a year, and is an increase in the appropriation of an amount sufficient to cover the number of carriers that are

now in the service by adding to the salary of each \$100 a year.

I find in this bill, and I find in the hearings before the Post Office Committee, large sums of money, amounting to about \$490,000, where the Government makes allowances to carriers in the cities for horse hire, vehicles, and for automobile hire. I find also that in the services of the cities there are allowances made for street-car fare when the carriers who deliver the mail in the cities are compelled to use conveyances, autothe mail in the cities are compelled to use conveyances, automobiles, or street cars; yet this great service, that has grown unto such proportions by the insistent demand of the people and their Representatives on this floor that since the time I have been in Congress in the past 10 years it has grown from an appropriation of \$30,000 to investigate the propriety of establishing the service to where we now readily contribute from the Public Treasury a sum of nearly \$40,000,000 a year. These people who carry out this great undertaking of the Government, the rural carriers, are required to furnish their own horses and vehicles and to maintain them, and yet are paid hardly enough salary to maintain themselves and their families.

I call attention to the evidence given before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads during this session, which shows that the Postmaster General has had information obtained and has furnished it to this committee, showing the expense in-curred by these carriers in the discharge of this important service of the Government, inaugurated for the benefit of that class of people who have not generally been special favorites

of legislation. I read from the hearings:

LETTER FROM THE POSTMASTER GENERAL.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, Washington, D. C., December 20, 1910.

Hon. John W. Weeks,

Chairman Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads,

House of Representatives.

Sir: In compliance with your request to furnish the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads of the House of Representatives informa-tion concerning changes in the rural and city letter-carrier forces for

the years 1907, 1908, 1909, and 1910, inclusive, by States, a report on the cost of rural carriers' equipment, and information as to the various laws that have been enacted pertaining to the rural-delivery mail system. I have the honor to submit the following:

The data pertaining to changes in the rural and city letter-carrier forces have not been compiled by States, and if such compilation is desired for use by your committee it would require the employment of a considerable force of clerks for several weeks. I also have to state that information as to the number of carriers separated from the city-delivery service during the fiscal years 1907 and 1908 is not immediately available, but, if desired, can possibly be furnished in the course of several weeks.

	Carriers employed.	Resigna- tions.	Removed.	Died.
RURAL LETTER CARRIERS.  June 30, 1907	37, 582 39, 143 40, 499 40, 997	4, 405 2, 124 2, 526 4, 035	156 165 175 228	190 178 208 187
June 30, 1907	24,577 26,352 27,620 28,715	368 308	194 146	189 154

In January, 1910, a circular letter was sent by the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General to all postmasters at rural-delivery offices directing them to report for each carrier the following:

(1) Number of horses used by each carrier under ordinary conditions.

(2) Number of horses used when extraordinary conditions prevail, such as muddy roads, snow, etc., and the entire length of time during a year when such extra horses are used.

(3) If carrier regularly drives two horses throughout the year, state why

(3) If carrier regularly drives two norses throughout the year, why.

(4) If the use of an extra horse, or horses, is necessary at times, what are the conditions which make it necessary.

(5) Prices paid for each horse and date of purchase.

(6) Price at which similar horses can be purchased at this time.

(7) Ascertain from dealers the average local prices prevailing during the last 12 months on various kinds of horse feed.

These reports were duly received, but owing to the fact that their compilation would require the employment of many clerks for a considerable period and to the pressure of other work of more importance, compilation has been made only for the State of Maryland, which is as follows:

follows:
On 151 routes from 50 post offices, 275 horses were used regularly, 51 extra horses being used on 44 routes.
The reported average value of 257 horses owned by carriers, \$156.12.
The average price of these horses is shown to be \$133.62.
The average price of horse feed shown by the compilation is as follows:

Corn	per	bushel	\$0.74 .59
	hundred	lweight	1.49
Hay Straw	I	oer ton	18. 32

The department has not called for reports on the cost of carriers' hicles, harness, repairs, shoeing, and veterinary services.

Respectfully,

FRANK H. HITCHCOCK Postmaster General.

I shall vote for any amendment that is permissible upon this bill that will pay these men a sufficient amount to enable them to live decently. The service has already been injured by resignations of many men. In my own district I have letters of complaint that the service is not paid sufficiently to enable the men to give their attention and their time and to save enough from it to decently support their families. According to the expense account rendered of these men to the Post Office De-partment, the feed of the horses, the purchase of the vehicles, and the expense of maintenance in many cases of two horses has been so great that in the past few years the carrier has received barely a subsistence for himself and his family. In the large cities-and I do not complain of it-these carriers are provided with means where they are required to use vehi cles; they are made allowances for it. When they are required to have automobiles, allowances are made for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I ask for two minutes.

Mr. WEEKS. I yield two minutes more to the gentleman from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that he may continue for two minutes. Is there

objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would vote for an increase to \$1,200 a year, but the effect of this amendment of mine simply makes an increase of \$100, which will not more than feed the horses the carrier is compelled to have to aid in the discharge of his duties. In a number of cases they have to have two, and the increase will hardly feed the horses required to be used. It will not do to say that the carrier in some localities performs the service in a few hours and

devotes the balance of his time to some other occupation. In

the country in which I live the carrier to travel 25 miles in the distribution of the mail can not, over the roads which we have-and they are as good as they are in any part of the country of a similar description to that in which I live say that he can not, after he has waited the arrival of the trains, deliver the mail to the patrons on the road and travel 25 miles in the discharge of that duty, delivering the mail, collecting it, and have any other work or business to which he can give any serious attention.

It is not so in my part of the country that the carrier devotes most of his time to some other kind of business. They have to devote all of their time to this business, which has been the greatest boon to that class of our citizens who carry on their shoulders the prosperity of our country.

Even the Postmaster General, who has not heretofore manifested any great friendship for this service, has this to say in his last report:

#### RURAL MAIL SERVICE.

Next to the heavy loss resulting from the low postage rate on secondclass mail, the principal inroad into the profits of the postal service is
that made by the excessive cost of rural delivery. The large expenditures for rural mail service are far more justifiable, however, than are
the much heavier payments required to meet the losses incurred on
account of second-class mail. Millions of dollars disbursed each year
for the latter purpose are paid out chiefly for the benefit of a comparatively small class of publishers, while the appropriations annually
granted to maintain and extend the rural-delivery system are expended
in the interests of a vast population. The advantages of rural delivery are such as to warrant its further extension, even at a considerable loss to the Government. It is believed, however, that without
checking the proper development of this branch of the postal service a
material reduction can be made in the rate of expense incurred. The
consolidation during the year of the star route and rural delivery
systems will undoubtedly accomplish much in this direction. For some
time past these two systems have provided practically the same kind of
mail delivery, but as they were managed quite independently of each
other much duplication of service resulted. Under the plan of consolidation recently put into effect the important postal facilities
provided by these two systems can be extended with less expense to the
Government, and with a probable gain in efficiency.

Not only in behalf of the men who perform this valuable

Not only in behalf of the men who perform this valuable service to our people, but in behalf of that great number of our people who receive this great benefit, I ask that this increase be allowed. The amendment proposed by me will increase the salary of the carrier to \$1,000 per annum. I am satisfied this House will adopt this amendment, and when it has done so I hope the chairman of the Post Office Committee will consent to another amendment which I shall propose, that after July 1, 1911, the salary of the carrier shall be \$1,000 per annum.

Fairness and justice to this class of Government employees demand this increase. For myself I would be willing to vote for \$1,200. But for the present I will be content to accept an increase that will make the salary \$1,000. Less than this is not a reasonable living salary, and I hope we may do that now. [Applause.]

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman— Mr. KENDALL. How does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield time? He has no time to yield.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto may end at a quarter past 1.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto may be closed at a quarter past 1. Is there objection?

Mr. HAMLIN. Reserving the right to object-

Mr. KENDALL. I reserve the right to object. Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman from Tennessee proceeding for five minutes?

Mr. HAMLIN. What is the request for unanimous consent? The CHAIRMAN. This debate is proceeding by unanimous consent. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Austin] has made a request of the Chair that he be allowed to proceed for five minutes. The Chair agreed to submit that request to the mmittee. Is there objection?
Mr. CAMPBELL. I have no objection to the gentleman from committee.

Tennessee proceeding, but I went upon the assumption that the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads was controlling the time, and he yielded to me five minutes.

Mr. KENDALL. He had nothing to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts does not control the time. The Chair is recognizing those whom he has agreed to recognize. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I feel it my duty to resent the insinuation of the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads in stating that the responsibility for failing to secure an increased salary for the rural-delivery carriers grows out of the fact that the Members who have bills looking to that increase had not appeared before the committee in behalf of their bills. I think if he will refresh his memory he will agree with the statement that during the last session of Congress a delegation of the Members of this House, who favored and proposed legislation along those lines, did appear before his committee

Mr. WEEKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. In a moment.

Mr. WEEKS. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman without his permission, but I wish to ask, Did not the gentleman misunderstand the chairman of the committee? The chairman of the committee intended to say-and I think did say-that they had not appeared before the committee at this session of Congress

Mr. AUSTIN. The insinuation or statement of the chairman was that this failure grew out of the fact that none of the Members advocating this legislation had appeared before the committee at this session of Congress. Now, during the last session of Congress about 15 Members of the House, who had introduced bills of this character, met, organized, and appointed a special committee to appear before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, and urged an increase of salaries for the carriers. The committee gave us a patient, careful hearing on the merits of that proposition. They did not report a bill, and when we afterwards sought on the floor of the House to accomplish what we had endeavored to accomplish through our hearing before the committee we were met by points of order and opposition from certain members of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. So the truth of the matter is, and the RECORD will sustain it, that the failure of the rural carriers of this country to get what they are entitled to—fair pay for their services—rests entirely with the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads; and I resent the intimation or insinuation that failure to secure justice at the hands of this Congress should be placed at the door of the authors of these bills, who in absolute good faith made their honest, earnest appeals to the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and the members of said committee. That committee will not report a single one of the bills either favorably or adversely, which would give us an opportunity on the floor of this House to vote an increase of pay for the rural carriers.

They will not report on our bills, but will take advantage of the rule of this House to interpose a point of order and prevent a vote and a fair consideration of the proposition which affects 40,000 of the hardest working and poorest paid men in the Government service to-day. If the committee will spend less time in blocking meritorious propositions of this kind by points of order and more in reporting bills to give the Members of this House opportunities to vote on them there would be less com-plaint at the failure of that committee to give us a square deal on this and similar propositions. If they were as active and as earnest in raising money for the Post Office Department by depriving the great express companies of monopolizing postal business they would have sufficient money to pay increased salaries of rural carriers. [Applause.]

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to have read in my time an amendment which perhaps I may offer before this paragraph is disposed of.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That no part of said sum shall be available for the payment of salaries of rural letter carriers except upon the following basis: The salary of a carrier shall be computed upon a basis of 15 cents per route mile per week day, i. e., the number of miles in each route shall be multiplied by 18 cents, and that sum multiplied by the number of week days in the year, and that amount expressed in dollars and cents shall be the annual salary of said carrier, but which sum shall be paid to him in 12 equal installments, paid monthly.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to have read in my time an amendment which, perhaps, I may offer before this paragraph is disposed of.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I understand that is read simply for information.

Mr. HAMLIN. That is all.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided. That no part of said sum shall be available for the payment of salarles of rural carriers except upon the following basis: The salary of a carrier shall be computed upon a basis of 18 per cent per route-mile per week day—i. e., the number of miles in each route shall be multiplied by 18 cents—and that amount expressed in dollars and cents shall be the annual salary of said carrier, but which sum shall be paid to him in 12 equal installments, paid monthly.

Mr. HAMLIN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am decidedly in favor of an increase of the salaries of the rural letter carriers of this country. I believe their salaries ought to be increased, however, on a just and equitable basis, taking into consideration the number of miles traveled by each carrier each day. As the salaries are now fixed by the Post Office Department they are not fair, not just, not equitable to all carriers.

The Fourth Assistant Postmaster General informs me that

the salaries as now fixed are as follows:

On routes 4 to 6 miles in length, \$360 per year; on routes from 6 to 8 miles in length, \$396; on routes 8 to 10 miles in length, \$432; on routes 10 to 12 miles in length, \$468; on routes 12 to 14 miles in length, \$504; on routes 14 to 16 miles in length, \$540; on routes 16 to 18 miles in length, \$630; on routes 18 to 20 miles in length, \$720; on routes 20 to 22 miles in length, \$810; on routes 22 to 24 miles in length, \$864; and on routes 24 miles and over, \$900.

So you will see at a glance that the carrier on a route 4 to 6 miles in length receives more than one-third as much pay as the carrier on a route 24 to 26 miles in length. In other words, the carrier on the short route travels only one-fifth as far per day as the man on the long route, but receives more than onethird as much pay. It therefore appears to me that the salary on each route ought to be fixed according to the number of

miles traveled; hence my amendment.

The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will not report a bill here increasing the salaries of these carriers for the reason, no doubt, that they are opposed to it, but I doubt not if the proposition could be put to a record vote in the House not one of them would have the courage to vote against the increase. But they take refuge behind a point of order to pre-

vent a vote. I have no sympathy with such practice.

I agree with the gentlemen who just addressed the committee that there is no class of employees of the Government that is as poorly paid for the service actually performed as are rural letter carriers. Go out into the country, as I have done, especially in my section, and you will see that there are certain seasons of the year when these men are almost entirely prevented from performing their duties on account of the condition of the roads and the weather. And yet these men are faithful, they are loyal, they attempt to perform their duties, notwithstanding the storm, the mud, the cold, and the rain. In my own district I know of cases where the roads have become wellnigh impassable in the spring of the year; times, in fact, when it is impossible for them to travel with a horse, much less with a horse and buggy—conditions under which the ordinary man would feel furnished a sufficient excuse to neglect his duty, but not so with many of these loyal, brave boys, for I have known some of them to put the mail upon their backs and attempt to walk over their routes, leaving the roads, which are impassable, and crossing the fences and through the fields; traveling on foot as far as it was possible to go so as to return within the schedule time to their offices. Yet you deny these loyal servants a niggardly increase in pay.

I say that men who are loyal enough to perform their duties day by day under unfavorable as well as favorable conditions ought to be paid a salary commensurate with the service which they perform. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, there is no service performed by the National Government out of which the rural population gets as much direct benefit as the rural mail service. And this class of people are entitled to it, for this class of our population furnishes largely the major portion of the revenues of this Government. Therefore you can not urge against this service that it is not self-sustaining. We appropriate each year for the maintenance and the extension of this service only about \$40,000,000, and much of that comes back to the Government in increased stamp cancellations, registers, and many other items incident to an enlarged use of the mails. But for the Navy Department, for instance, we appropriate each year about \$130,000,000, not one cent of which finds

its way back into the National Treasury.

Yet many of you raise no complaint about that. I am decidedly in favor of economy, but, Mr. Chairman, you know there are at least two kinds of economy, to wit, real and false, reasonable and unreasonable, economy. Let us see if you are in favor of real economy and if you are consistent and reasonable

Only to-day it has developed that there is now on its way through Congress a provision put on the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill raising the salary of the Secretary to the President from \$6,000 to \$10,000 a year. You also create a new office, to be known as Second Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Labor, and give him a salary of \$5,000 a year. You also propose to increase the salary of the Librarian of Congress \$500 a year and the Director of the Bureau of Stand-

ards \$1,000 a year. And in your generosity you did not forget the Civil Service Commission. You propose to give it \$5,000 additional each year with which to employ more expert examiners. Now, I would like to make this proposition, if you will guarantee that these expert examiners will be expert enough to discover one good and sufficient reason for the existence of the Civil Service Commission, I believe I would enter no objection to their employment. But feeling, I presume, that you have not yet fully demonstrated your generosity to the "interests" of the country, you now have reported to this House a bill which creates five new officers, known as members of a Tariff Board, four of whom shall each receive a salary of \$7,000 a year, and one shall receive a salary of \$7,500 a year, making a neat little salary roll for the five men of \$35,500 a year. Yet, when we ask for a beggarly increase of \$200 or \$300 a year for the rural carriers you throw up your hands and tell us that it can not be allowed, the condition of the Treasury will not permit-that we must economize.

The chairman of the committee has said that if we were to let out these routes by contract we could no doubt get bids for carrying this mail at a cost less than we now pay these carriers. Perhaps that is true, and I have no doubt that if we were to let out the job of Congressman to the lowest bidder that there would be at least a million men who would offer to take our jobs at not over \$100 a year, but if they were engaged what kind of service do you think would be rendered?

Mr. Chairman, the kind of economy of which I am in favor to pay the employee of the Government a reasonable, just, and fair wage for the services he renders, and no more.

That is all I ask for the rural letter carriers, but this much

I do ask.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I can not bring myself to the idea that the appropriation for the maintenance of rural free delivery should be suspended if certain legislation is not enacted. I am not in favor of suspending the delivery of the rural mail on any pretext, but I am in favor of increasing the pay of rural carriers. Whatever the conditions may have been when the Rural Free Delivery Service was inaugurated, the fact now is that almost every rural carrier must have from two to three horses, and of course must feed and care for his horses

at his own expense.

Everyone knows that horses are now so high that the rural carrier has an investment for his vehicle and his two or three horses of between \$300 and \$500. Horses sicken and die, and the carrier stands these losses constantly. On the other hand, as has been stated here, and it is true, there is no public servant who renders service that is more appreciated by a greater part of the people than the carrier of the rural mail. Whether the weather is fine and the roads good or whether the weather is bad and the roads poor, the carrier must go out and carry messages of cheer or sadness to the people along the lines of his route. He must go and return within a given time over the prescribed route every day. It will not be denied by any Member of the House that the pay is the lowest paid by the Government to its employees. The service rendered is worth the salary paid and more, but almost one-third of it must be paid out in expenses for horses, harness, vehicles, or automobiles. amount of the salary now paid at least should be net to the carrier.

If I had my way about it I should fix a flat rate of \$1,200 a year for every man on a rural route above 24 miles. I would do that in order to do justice to a faithful and deserving public That would enable him to perform his duty as he is required by law to perform it, and leave him, above expenses,

about what his salary now is.

Many of the rural carriers, where there are six or eight of them delivering out of a given post office, now make an arrangement with a livery-stable keeper for the use of horses every day that mail is carried, and they pay \$1 a day for the use of these animals. That leaves them the small sum of about \$45 a month for their services. Now, the requirements on their time are such that they can not do anything else. They can not be employed in any other capacity, and it is hard, as every man here knows, for a man to maintain a family on \$45 a month in any town or village in the United States. The rural carrier must go out on the route every day whether he is well or ill and perform the service that is required for this small sum of money, and I submit that there is no demand made upon this floor for the increase of appropriation or an increase of salary that is more worthy than is the demand for an increase of salary for rural carriers.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, want to indorse the remarks made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Austin], by stating that not only one Member of this House who introduced a bill went before the Post Office Committee, but every Member of the House who introduced a bill went in a body before that committee. Not only that, but on several different days those of us who are friends of the rural carriers were last year before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads urging an increase. It is the same committee this year, and we made our appeal to this committee in vain. The gentleman from Tennessee is exactly right when he states that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Weeks], the chairman of the committee, by his remarks, puts all of these gentlemen who introduced bills in a light which is not proper before the country. Since the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads have assumed the responsibility of declining to report either of these bills, they ought not now try to evade that responsibility, but they should now assume that responsibility, because they can now bring out a bill if they will.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is another matter that I desire to call to the attention of the House in reference to the rural mail service. I do not know who is responsible for it. I know that I have been to the Post Office Department repeatedly, and have appealed to that department for simple justice. I know that I have appealed in vain. Some men say that the trouble is with the Postmaster General. Other men say that it is higher up, and that the order comes from the President of the United States. In any event, I know that in my section of the country, and especially in my State, about 100 rural routes have been approved and not one has been established. In my own district the star-route service has in some cases been discontinued, with the idea that it would soon be replaced with the rural service, and this extension of the service has been stopped by order of the Post Office Department, and in many sections of my district people are living from three and a half to as high as six and a half miles from a post office or from a rural route, We have petitioned the Post Office Department in vain. Notwithstanding the fact that this Congress appropriated last year a million and a quarter dollars for the extension of this service, and I am informed by a member of the committee that with what was left over there are \$1,700,000 to the credit of this service, yet the people, with this mandate of Congress to extend rural service, are unable to get a single new route instituted, and the extension of this service has been practically stopped all over the United States, as I am informed. My information is that only a very few rural routes have been established in a year. I want to know what sort of autocratic power this is that ignores the manifest expression of this legislative body. Forsooth, upon what meat do these our Cæsars feed that they can ignore the express will and mandate of the House and the Senate in reference to the extension of this service, which commends itself to the House and the Senate? think the country ought to know the reason for the demoralization of the mail service. I heard a gentleman say yesterday that the railway mail service out west was demoralized. I know that the rural service is demoralized; and it seems to me, from the reports, that the mail service all over the United States is in a most demoralized and chaotic condition. [Applause.]
Now I do not believe that the Post Office Department has

Now I do not believe that the Post Office Department has the right to ignore the manifest wishes and express will of Congress in reference to this matter. I feel that this rural service ought to be continued and extended until every man can get mail at his own door. I want the people of our section of the country, who are clamoring to have this rural service continued and extended, to understand that the fault is not with Congress, but that the fault is with the Post Office Department, or with somebody higher up, so that the responsibility may rest where it belongs. [Applause.]

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to speak upon this amendment or the point of order, but I wish to call the attention of the gentleman who has made the point of order against this provision to what is contained lines 19 to 23, inclusive, in reference to the Lake Winnepe-saukee route. This route is a water route, of course, and is a money getter. It yields, after paying the carrier the full amount of \$900, six or seven hundred dollars a year net to the Government, and for that reason I hope whoever has made the point of order against this provision will not insist upon The route in that section, the Switzerland of America, in which this beautiful lake is situated, is inhabited during the summer season by business men from all sections of this country. They are mostly business men. Those islands that a short time ago had no residences upon them are now dotted over with fine mansions and populated by thousands and thousands of people during the summer season, and, as I say, they are mostly business men, and the mail is immense. My impression is that during the last summer season this carrier handled something like 240,000 or 250,000 pieces, and he handles more mail than the city from which he starts, La-

conia, with a population of 10,000, handles in the whole year. There is not any expense to anybody; the discretion is entirely with the Postmaster General to allow him what he ought to have, not exceeding \$900 a year. I am now asking the gentleman who makes the point of order against this provision not to insist upon it, and that is all I have to say in regard to the matter.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I again address the committee for the purpose of putting the effect of my amendment clearly to the House and of letting the committee know exactly what the amendment affects. I frankly confess that if this amendment passes, if the point of order is not sustained against it, that it will be necessary for the Post Office Committee to report a bill increasing the rural carriers' salaries to \$1,200 per annum on the maximum routes and in proportion to that on routes of shorter length. Now, then, if the Post Office Committee fails to act, and if this House fails to act favorably upon the proposition of increasing salaries of rural carriers, the Rural Delivery Service temporarily is held up. But I think I know the game of men enough to know that the Post Office Committee and the House of Representatives will not dare, for the economy effected, by keeping salaries at \$900 a year, to hold up for any length of time the Rural Delivery Service of this country. therefore believe that the moment this House acts favorably upon this amendment you will find the Post Office Committee getting busy at once preparing a bill which will conform the salaries of rural carriers to the amendment thus adopted by the committee. I have no fear that those gentlemen of the committee will continue to sit idle upon this proposition, or, if not sitting idle, continue to act unfavorably upon the efforts of men throughout the country to give the rural carriers a decent living and a fair salary. The gentleman from Tennessee called attention to a fact I had forgotten, that last year a committee, representing a number of Members of Congress, appeared before the Post Office Committee and urged favorable consideration of the 40 or 50 bills pending there for increase in rural carriers' salaries.

Mr. FINLEY. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?
Mr. LEVER. Yes.
Mr. FINLEY. I wish to say to the gentleman that it will not

Mr. FINLEY. I wish to say to the gentleman that it will not be denied that in this Congress at this session the Post Office Committee by a majority vote did not increase the salaries of rural carriers to \$1,050.

Mr. LEVER. I would like to ask my colleague, who is on the committee, in that connection—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVER. I would just like one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LEVER. I would like to ask my colleague, who is a

Mr. LEVER. I would like to ask my colleague, who is a member of the committee, if in his judgment the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and this House will dare to hold up the Rural Delivery Service because the committee will not increase the pay of the carriers throughout the country?

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman, my colleague, that I will not, but I am only a minority member of the committee. I am heartly in favor of increasing the salary of the carriers, and have done everything I could to bring it about but I am in a minority.

it about, but I am in a minority.

Mr. LEVER. I want to say that this amendment is a "big stick" by which we hope to make the Post Office Committee act in conformity with the wishes of the majority of the Members of this House.

Mr. FINLEY. I can only speak for myself. I have supported the proposition for an increase of rural-carrier pay here and elsewhere.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to emphasize some of the remarks made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] with reference to the action of the Post Office Department in holding up the installation of new rural routes. There is a demand for this service coming from every section of the country. I know that it is true of sections in my State, Mr. Chairman, which are not provided with these routes. They request that routes be established and that the people be given the same privileges and the same benefits of this great service that other communities in the same section of the country are being given.

More than a year ago, when the Post Office Department was approached with reference to the matter, the reply came that they did not have money sufficient with which to establish these routes. At the last session of Congress this House answered that reply by appropriating money for the purpose of establishing new routes, and yet here, after the year has passed, we are in the same situation as before. Somebody, and I do

not know who it is, having authority in this matter, has seen fit to oppose the mandates of the House as expressed in the last appropriation bill, and refused to carry out its wishes by giving this service to those people who are entitled to it and are not now provided with it. I do not know, Mr. Chairman, who is responsible for it. For my part, I do not believe that it is the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General or those directly in charge of rural routes. I have a suspicion—in fact, I have received information to the effect—that it comes from those who are higher up.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I say that it is an injustice to people all over this country, and to people in my district who are not provided with this service, and who have met all the requirements of the law and of the Post-Office Department with reference to the establishment of rural routes, not to give them the same benefits that are being given to other sections and other There is now, for instance, in one single particular, a rural-route petition from citizens in one of the counties I represent, pending in the Post Office Department, which was approved nearly one year ago, after being carefully examined by an inspector. He reported that the petitioners had met all the requirements, and yet, notwithstanding repeated requests from me, made in response to numerous letters from patrons of the mails who are anxious to have this service established, we can not secure the installation of that route.

Now, Mr. Chairman, one other word with reference to the salaries of rural carriers. As a general proposition, I do not favor a raise in salaries, but I think it would be simply an act of justice to give the rural-route carrier a salary commensurate with the work he is doing and to enable him to support his family and send his children to school. [Applause.] aries of Members of Congress, Federal judges, and other higher officials were increased a few years ago, but when a proposition is made to increase the salary of the rural-route carrier or a clerk who receives a small wage which is barely sufficient to maintain him, the objection is heard that the Treasury will not admit of it. There is even now a proposition pending to still further increase the salaries of certain of the Federal judges. I am opposed to any such legislation. If we are to increase salaries, let us begin with the small-paid employee, and I favor increasing his salary only when justice demands it. As has been said here, Mr. Chairman, the rural route carrier has an expense that attaches possibly to no other employee of the Government; and I want to say that when you take his expenses and the work he does into consideration he is the poorest paid employee in the Government service to-day. It is necessary for him to carry the mails 25 or 26 miles every day over the hills and across the valleys, in all sorts of weather and under all sorts of conditions. He has to have at least two horses and sometimes three for the purpose of performing this service, and he has to pay for the care and feed for those horses out of his own pocket. I say that when he takes the expenses out of his salary—when he provides his own buggy, when he maintains it, and pays those expenses incidental to the work he performs—he has not enough, Mr. Chairman, with which to support his family. These men are good citizens. Speaking for my section, they are among the most loyal of our citizens. They are loyal servants of the Government, and I think it is the duty of Congress to see to it that they are at least given a modicum of the justice that is accorded to other employees of this Government. [Applause.]

Mr. GRONNA rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I would like to have read for the information of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

That on and after July 1, 1911, letter carriers of the Rural Delivery Service shall receive a salary of \$1,020 per annum on routes of a distance more than 25 miles.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of increasing the rural carrier's salary to \$1,200 per annum, but it is evident that the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will not accept any amendment that will materially increase the rural carrier's I have therefore proposed the amendment just read, and offer it as an emergency measure. The amount asked for in this amendment is not what I believe the carrier should have or what he is entitled to, but it is perhaps all we can get at this time, and I hope the chairman of the committee will not make a point of order against an amendment to increase the pay \$10 per month.

Everybody knows and admits that \$900 per year is inadequate pay for the services the carrier must perform on a standard route, and in my State and many of the new States the car-

rier must travel 30 and 35 miles. If the route is less than 24 miles the carrier's pay is reduced, and I believe that it is only simple justice to pay the carrier extra for every mile over that of a standard 24-mile route.

Mr. Chairman, I fully indorse what other Members of the House have said in regard to the rural carrier being underpaid. The rural carriers are paid less for their services than any other men in the service of the Government. I have read a part of the hearings before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, and I find in the testimony of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General that he admits that the rural carrier's pay is inadequate; I believe that every Member of the committee will admit that the salary is too small.

Now, then, why should we practice this false economy, for that The people are not complaining about the expenses is all it is? incurred by the Post Office Department, but they are complaining about the service, and justly so. I said on this floor a year ago that more than a million people were denied mail service at that time; more than 2,000 routes that should have service were held up. I again make the statement that a great number of citizens of this country have inadequate postal service.

The Post Office Department was not established for profit. was established for the purpose of giving the people the best possible mail service, whether the department is self-sustaining or not. It was undoubtedly the intention that all the people should have mail service, whether in the cities or in the rural districts. I have never opposed any move for increase of pay to city carriers; I do not believe they are overpaid; but I know that the rural carriers are underpaid.

Mr. Chairman, the Post Office Department is turning back into the Treasury this year \$1,700,000-money appropriated by Congress for the maintenance and extension of the rural service. What right has the Post Office Department to refuse to carry out the mandate of Congress? It is a violation of law and a gross injustice to the people. There is in my State perhaps more than 150 routes that should have service-cases where all the requirements have been met and all the rules and regula-tions of the department complied with, but where the department has refused to use the money appropriated by Congress to put these routes into operation, in order that a showing of seeming economy may be made.

It is true that Congress has failed to increase the pay of the rural carriers, but it has provided for the maintenance and extension of the service. Last year \$300,000 was turned back into the Treasury as unexpended balances, which could and should have been used by the department for the extension of the service. I say that this is false economy and not in compliance with the pledges in the Republican platform adopted at Chicago in 1908. This is what the platform contains:

We favor the extension of free rural mail delivery until every community in the land receives the full benefit of the postal service. [Loud applause.]

[Mr. DOUGLAS addressed the Committee, See Appendix.]

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, there are some applications for an increase of salary which possess little merit. others that are highly meritorious. The application on the part of the rural carriers belongs to the latter class. I will not pause to speak of the great work that is being done by these officials. Day in and day out, without regard to the weather, in storm and in sunshine, they deliver the mails in the country districts with unfailing regularity and with almost clocklike precision. They deserve well at the hands of the Government. All are agreed on that point. But what is it that constitutes the great merit of their application for a moderate increase of compensation? is not alone that the increased cost of living has increased their domestic expenses of a purely household character.

This is true of all employees of the Government. of all persons living on fixed salaries. But the situation of the rural carrier is a peculiar and exceptional one. Unlike most of the employees of the Government, he is required to furnish an equipment which constitutes a relatively large initial outlay when he enters the service; moreover, the upkeep of this equipment is considerable. In addition, the annual de-preciation of his horses and vehicles is a material factor in the carrier's financial problem. A year ago a number of carriers submitted itemized statements, a sort of balance sheet. for six months. These statements came from different portions of the country, but having in mind the slightly varying cost of supplies, due to local conditions, they told a singularly uniform and concurrent story.

The total of actual expenses for six months ran from \$212 to \$271. The amount of salary in each case for the six months was \$450. The net earnings ran from \$179 to \$237 for the time taken. Figures were also submitted for 42 States, showing the average net earnings per month in each State and the average net earning throughout the United States. The average net earning per month in the country at large was \$31.50, and the average net earning for six months was \$189. This leaves the carrier, who is a qualified civil-service expert, less than \$400 per year on which to live and with which to feed, clothe, and educate his family.

Now, this makes a much stronger case than that of the department clerk, who has no outfit to maintain, and who is affected in the increased cost of living merely in his domestic expenditures. I know the objection that many legislators have to an advance in salaries. They may admit merit in certain claims for an increase, but they are afraid to open the gates, lest the waters of a universal increase will wash them away. There is some merit in this attitude, for it is true that when we begin to advance salaries in any one department, or in any one section of the service, the omitted departments or sections will multiply their demands, and use the advances already made as an additional reason why their requests should be accorded.

But this attitude of universal opposition to any form of increase can not be indefinitely maintained. We must confront each situation on its merits. No one regarded the salaries originally attached to the rural carriers' positions as extravagant or excessive. With the lapse of time, and the rapidly advancing cost of living, they have become inadequate and insufficient. If this body was not unwilling or afraid to attach a reasonable salary to the place when it was established, we ought not to be either unwilling or afraid to afford a reasonable increase when the facts justify that action. I repeat what I said in the discussion of this proposition a year ago: The Government of the United States can not afford to be unjust. Be just, even though the political heavens should fall. Curtail your ambitious military and naval program, and you will have ample means with which to make glad the anxious and expectant hearts of this body of faithful public servants.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I am willing and will be glad to vote for any of the several amendments pending to increase the pay of the rural carriers and to extend the service. rural carriers, in my opinion, are the poorest paid of any of the Government employees and their service best appreciated by the

I hope the day is not far distant when all may enjoy its advantages.

I appeared before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads at the last session of this Congress with other Members to urge the favorable report of some of the many bills there pending, among the number my own. There was a manifest unfriendliness in that committee to any legislation looking to-

ward the increase of salary now under consideration.

Some of the members looked with favor upon our efforts, but it was as plain as day that there was nothing doing in that committee. Just why I can not say; but it is apparent by the number of gentlemen who have to-day spoken and who are anxious to speak in favor of the same that the general sentiment on the floor of this House is in favor of an extension of the rural service, with better pay.

I took occasion to examine many of the reports then on exhibition to the committee from carriers in every section, as furnished by Mr. Brown, the editor of the Rural Free Delivery News, as to the cost of keeping up and maintaining their equipment. A carrier who has a maximum route must keep two A team of horses can not be fed and conveyances kept up, with reasonable allowance for wear and tear and depreciation, for \$1 per day; probably \$1.50 would not be far from fair. What does that give the carrier for the support of himself and family? Less than he can make by the day at common labor.

These carriers, aside from being good citizens, are, as a rule, men of more than ordinary intelligence, capable of commanding good wages. They have no snap, no time to engage in other pursuits. I know that the carriers in my home town devote their whole time to their duties as carriers and to no other purpose. I believe this is true in every section where the route is 25 miles or more in length. I am in favor of economy and retrenchment where there is opportunity, but certainly, gentlemen, these faithful servants of the people are entitled to and should receive an additional allowance, and I trust that this Congress will not let the opportunity pass by.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, as the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia is practically the same as the one offered by myself last year, and if adopted would have the effect of having made provision for the increase of salaries of rural-route carriers \$100 per year, I am glad to support the amendment; but, Mr. Chairman, since the chairman of the committee has offered his amendment, which provides for an increase of salaries which will do an act of justice to a most

worthy class of people, and to that class, too, who for the amount of service rendered and the character of the service considered, receive the smallest pay of any employees of the Government; I congratulate the chairman of the commit-tee on the spirit he has manifested in this matter, and congratulate the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mann] for an exhibition of willingness on his part to withdraw the point of order and thus permit the House to do an act of justice that has already been too long delayed. I most heartily approve of the amendment of the chairman of the committee and will give it my earnest support, thus giving to the carriers on rural

routes \$1,000 per year.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, the many proposed amendments and the heated discussion regarding the rural free-delivery carriers proves conclusively the interest of the country

in this useful class of public servants.

Speaking from a practical knowledge of the work done by these men, in my judgment, they, as well as the city carriers, should be paid decent living salaries. No class of officials so well earn the wages paid them as our letter carriers, and none come into such close personal relations with the people. I am in favor of doing justice to all the employees of the Government, and especially the men in the great Post Office Department. The laborer is worthy of his hire. However, I did not rise to discuss so self-evident a proposition, but to ask unanimous consent to print in the Record an excerpt of the Daily Consular and Trade Reports, issued by the Department of Commerce and Labor, which is a statement of the American consul at Prague, showing the improper use of the American flag as an advertisement on goods made and sold in Austria, as well as other European countries, with the hope that the Department of State will take cognizance of the matter:

[Daily Consular and Trade Reports, Monday, Jan. 16, 1911.]

MERCANTILE SALES SYSTEMS IN BOHEMIA. (From Consul Joseph I. Brittain, Prague, Austria.)

I visited a leading stationery store in Prague recently and inquired whether a certain brand of writing paper was manufactured in the United States, the boxes being decorated with United States flags printed on the covers, and the labels printed in English. The proprietor informed me that the paper was made in Paris after an Ameri-

prietor informed me that the paper was made in Paris after an American pattern.

Another business establishment, profusely decorated with American flags, is selling typewriters made in Germany after an American pattern. The German factory making these machines prints the name of the machine in German for the German trade, and in Czech (Bohemian) for the Czech customers.

Many of the shoe stores have the American flag displayed on or near Austrian-made shoes. Possibly these stores have in stock a few pairs of American-made shoes. Another house sells imitation diamonds and other cheap jewelry, advertising as an American concern, while another displays the sign "Anglo-American Co.," where neither American nor English capital is invested.

WHY NOT GIVE THE BOHEMIANS AMERICAN MANUFACTURES? WHY NOT GIVE THE BOHEMIANS AMERICAN MANUFACTURES?

If the sale of foreign-made merchandise is facilitated by advertising it as American, certainly the genuine should sell better than the imitation. There is an excellent opportunity here to sell American merchandise, Prague being the trade center of Bohemia and Bohemia being the industrial center of Austria; but these goods should, so far as possible, be sold in stores selling exclusively a line of American merchandise. Where this has been done the sale of American merchandise has rapidly increased; for example, such lines as shoes, sewing machines, typewriters, cash registers, heating stoves, etc. Naturally where the articles are small and the sales limited there can not be exclusive stores.

HOW AMERICANS RETARD THEIR OWN TRADE.

Recently a general agent for an excellent moderate-priced American typewriter visited Prague, and I tried to prevail upon him to establish a direct agency here instead of making it a subagency of Vienna, but the general agency was given to persons in Vienna. Prague, with 80 per cent of the inhabitants speaking a different language from the Viennese, was made a subagency, and this subagency placed with a banking firm, instead of giving it to an experienced person acquainted with the typewriter. These machines are sold in the United States at \$65 retail, while the Prague agent is asking \$132, a price in excess of that asked for the highest grade American standard machines in Prague. If these machines were sold here at \$70, or 350 crowns, which would be adding \$5 for duty and freight, or even at \$80, and sold by an active agent, having at heart the welfare of the American manufacturer, 300 to 500 machines should be sold each year, but this can not be done by inexperienced salesmen asking twice the price at which they are sold in the United States.

American Heating Stoves in Prague.

AMERICAN HEATING STOVES IN PRAGUE.

A firm recently established here to sell American heating stoves is selling upward of 500 annually, and stoves are among the most difficult articles to sell in Bohemia, because, on account of their weight, transportation is difficult, and each room of every apartment house must contain a stove when the house is finished, and for hundreds of years these stoves have been made of tile. A conservative people are not quick to change a long-established custom, but when the agent tells the customer, and proves his assertion, that the American reservoir stove will heat closer to the floor, and that one of his American base-burners will heat more space than three of the old-fashloned tile stoves, which must be fired each day, his statement is convincing.

There is no better field in Europe for the sale of American merchandise than Bohemia, for it is the great industrial center of Austria. Prague, with its 500,000 population, is an excellent distributing point, If American manufacturers were to apply American methods in attempting to sell their wares in Bohemia, their sales would increase 100 per cent, but the antiquated letter and printed circular in English will not accomplish this.

accomplish this.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, where does the opposition to this increase come from? The speeches made on both sides of the House yesterday and to-day clearly indicate that the sentiment of the Representatives is in favor of increasing the salaries of these rural carriers. The opposition evidently comes from the majority members of the committee. It is a well-known fact that the minority members of this committee are in favor of an increase for the rural carriers. From the information that has been given here this morning and yesterday upon this subject, it is plainly evident that the present administration is not friendly to the rural service. we have the extension of the rural service practically prevented, with large appropriations to extend the service, and yet but few routes were created last year-with a million or more dollars left to the credit of the service and no material extension of the service. Now, Mr. Chairman, we have but to take cases that exist in my own district as an illustration: In the city of Savannah city mail carriers receive fairly good salaries, far in excess of the salaries of the rural carriers. You leave the city of Savannah, where the men carry the mail for four or five hours in the day, and draw fairly good salaries upon which to live. Then go out in the country and you meet with the rural carriers, keeping up their own vehicles, horses, and equipment, and maintaining themselves as best they can on meager salaries. I say it is a gross discrimination against the people of the country and against the rural carriers. I for one, as a Member of this House, will never again vote for an increase in any department of the Post Office until the rural mail carriers have proper recognition here. [Loud applause.]

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I have expressed my views so often on this subject, with so little effect, and there is such a demand for recognition, that I am loth to occupy the time of the Committee of the Whole; but I do wish to enter my protest one more time against that kind of economy that will impair the efficiency of the best branch of the postal service under a false and misplaced cry of diminishing the expenditures of the Government. I shall support the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Barlett]. I will support any proposition to increase the salaries of the rural letter carriers, those most faithful servants of the people, and any proposition that will make sure of sending them to the door of every

American citizen with the mail.

I would like also to relax the restrictive rule of false economy enough to equalize the injustice in the system. Under an iniquitous gradation of 2 miles instead of a quarter of a mile almost every rural letter carrier I know is being robbed. who go more than 24 miles are sent the additional distance without scruple, because it does not cost anything. Those who have routes of less than 24 miles very often have 200 yards cut off in order that the pay for 2 miles may be saved. This great Government does not need to rob its faithful servants in that way, and there is no use for us to say that we are bound down by limitations and conditions that prevent us from remedying We go to the department, and the department these things. says, "We can not do these things, because the appropriation is not big enough." Then, we come here to the committee, and the committee says, "The department has recommended so Fie on such double dealing! [Applause.] how, and we often find ways to do what we want, and I proclaim to the country now and to you, my comrades, here, if you want to remedy this evil and pay these people more, there is a way for us to do it, and I am willing to help you. [Applause.] Let us do something to-day. [Applause.]

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, if there is any one department more than another in this Government that ought to be encouraged and made of great usefulness to the people it is the Post Office Department. It comes nearer serving all of the people than any other department of the Government, and yet here are a class of Government employees who are working practically for starvation wages. Many of them ought to receive much greater pay than that which is given to them for

the services they render.

Now, it seems to be the policy of economy of the majority in this House to reduce the pay and economize on that branch of the Government which is of greatest use and most convenience to the people. You have raised the salary of the President \$25,000 a year. You have raised the salary of every Cabinet officer, including the Postmaster General, \$4,000 a year; you have raised the salary of every big office holder, many of whom ought not to have had their salaries increased; and yet these men, who undergo the great exposure and the severe labors that they have to perform, have had no increase in their salaries. They have not received fair and proper consideration at the hands of Congress, but have been neglected. Other increases have been made for the reason assigned that the cost of living

has increased, so that the increases have been made necessary. The cost of living for these men has likewise increased, and yet no increase whatever has been made in their salaries. They serve a class of people to whom no other convenience of this Government is extended—the people in the country. They have few of the conveniences which are enjoyed by the people who live in cities, and these employees serve that class of people who receive no other visible benefit from the Government.

You are expending a large amount of money for building battleships and improving the Navy. You had better increase the expenditures to bring to the people of this country a knowledge of what is going on in the country. Expand their opportunities and better their facilities to keep in touch with all the world and improve the condition of the people who support the Government by paying the taxes levied. It will be much better expended for that purpose than any other. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, last year there was an appropriation made to extend this line of service. For some reason this Government has refused to use that money for the purpose for which it was appropriated. Is this the kind of economy that you intend to practice, in order to go before the country and claim that you are using economy in the appropriations? What right has any department of this Government, however big it may be, to refuse to carry out the mandates of Congress, when money has been appropriated for a specified purpose, as was done in this case? [Applause.]

I am an advocate of economy and thoroughly believe it should be scrupulously practiced in all public service, but it is not wise to cripple public service by parsimony and discrimination against any class of public servants or any class of people. This is being done in this department, and a large number of the people of the Government suffer on account thereof. They are denied important public service, and the men who perform this very valuable service are not adequately compensated for their labors.

Mr. Chairman, this bill carries an appropriation for the carrying of the mails by the railroads alone of over \$56,000,000, an enormous sum. It is conceded it is a very liberal sum for the services rendered. The truth is it is an exorbitant allowance, unjustifiable according to good business methods, and deserves condemnation. This is so because it seems the railroads are favored by the party in power and can secure more liberal consideration at its hands than can the people or almost any other business institution. This is unjust and unwarranted, but it prevails, and is so strongly fortified that it can not, it seems, be corrected. It is conceded it should be, but we are powerless to do it. It would be wise, in my judgment, that from this enormous sum appropriated deductions be made sufficient to reduce it to a reasonable and fair compensation and the difference applied to increase the pay of these men whose services are important, whose exposures are great, and whose labors are arduous, in order that simple justice and fair dealing may prevail in the Government service. For fair treatment for them I appeal to-day, and hope my appeal shall not be made in vain. [Applause.] We owe it to them, we owe it to the country, we owe it to the good administration of public affairs that correction in this matter be made. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of increasing the pay of these employees and, if need be, cut down the salaries of some of the other employees who have more lucrative jobs than have these men who undertake the very hardest toll that is performed in the Government service and fulfill an important func-

tion for the people. [Applause.]

[Mr. STEENERSON addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the numerous amendments presented before this House clearly indicate the importance of the question now under consideration. The maximum salary of the rural free-delivery carrier is \$900. From this amount he is required to furnish his own equipment. From 7,000 carriers, embracing almost every congressional district in this Union, it has been discovered that the net earnings per carrier is only \$31.50 per month, which is far less than a common laborer receives. These carriers are required to stand an examination before they can be accepted as being eligible, and not only that, but they must furnish certificates of good character. In that connection I desire to say in behalf of this great army of 40,000 carriers that during the last fiscal year there were only 175 who were discharged for cause, being about four-tenths of 1 per cent, whereas among the 60,000 postmasters of this great nation there were 1,000 who were discharged for cause, or 1.6 per cent.

Mr. Chairman, in order to make the system perfect it is necessary to retain the trained men. I wish to say this, that in 1908 there were 344 changes; in 1909, 484 changes, which was 40 per cent. In the first three months of 1910 there was 40 per cent. In the first three months of 1910 there were nearly 1,500 changes, whereas in the first three months of the preceding year there were 776, being nearly 100 per cent. That clearly indicates that the gentlemen on this service are not being paid according to the amount of work that they are doing, and I sincerely hope that this salary will be increased to an amount commensurate with the service they render. [Applause.]

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to delay the House long in what I shall have to say on this subject. It is a well-known fact that since I have had the honor to have a seat upon the floor of this House I have been an earnest advocate and supporter of the Rural Delivery Service, its extension and development. It was the first and, indeed, almost the only great benefit that has been bestowed upon the people who live in the country throughout this great Republic. It came to them as a blessing at the time that it did come. It has continued to be a blessing from that hour up to the present time. Some of the sections of the country have been provided for very liberally, they have been threaded with routes so that they are now well covered, and practically every citizen is given the service. I do not believe there should be any distinction made in any of the different sections of the country, as between the citizens of this Republic, but that each and all should receive the blessings at the hands of the Government alike. Therefore, in the sections of the country wherever they may be-North, South, East, or West-that are not now receiving this service in the way and to the extent it has been received in other parts of the country, there should be a change made, and those sections should receive service equal with other sections of the country. It has been said that routes are being held up when they have been approved, when every regulation of the department has been complied with, and where everything has been done by the people which the law or the department requires, and yet the service has not been given to them. It seems to me it is an injustice which can not be condoned and which ought not to be further permitted.

It was said a moment ago that there were 1,054 routes standing approved in the department that are not being put in op-The money was appropriated to put at least a great many into operation, but with a view of economy the money was not expended, and was said to have been returned to the Treasury in order to reduce the deficit in the Post Office De-I believe in economy as much as anybody in the world, but I do not believe in economy that does not economize for the benefit of the people of the country. Instead of economizing for their benefit such conduct as that only economizes to their injury. When the money is given to the department for the purpose, then the executive department has no right to refuse to expend the money, because it is the duty of the executive department to execute the law and not to make law.

[Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, there is no interest in all this land that contributes as much to the Government and to its support, prosperity, and development as the agricultural interests, and this service is especially given for the benefit of the agricultural people of the United States. The department has said that there are no more efficient and faithful servants in the employ of the Government, if as efficient and faithful, than the rural-The record shows they have been faithful delivery carriers. and efficient, that they are honest, patriotic, and loyal. They go from early morn until the late hours of the evening in the discharge of their duties; whether it be sunshine or rain, sleet or snow, you will find them at their posts doing what the law requires to be done and complying with every obligation that

rests upon them.

They are efficient and they are faithful, and, as has been said upon this floor, they are underpaid, and I dare say there is not a man here or elsewhere who will contradict it. They are not paid in accordance with the amount of work which they perform. Then when they are efficient, when they are faithful, and when they are laboring in the interest of the people of this country who contribute most to the welfare and development of the Republic, why should we stand and refuse them their just deserts? We are the servants of the people and not the lords of the people, and if we are to respond to their requests and to their interests and for their development and for their welfare we can not respond any better than to come to the rescue of these faithful servants and efficient officers who serve the people from day to day and who discharge every duty incumbent upon them in the interest and welfare of all the people. [Loud applause.]

Mr. COX of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, if I remember the record correctly, there is an amendment pending, offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Lever], which, if adopted, will increase the salary to \$1,200 a year. An amendment, offered by the gentleman from Georgia, read for information, would increase the salary of the rural route carrier \$100 a year. I have been opposed to the incease of salary of any man since I have been here, yet when it is going on every day almost in some way or manner, and believing that the rural-route carriers are a deserving class of people, I am of opinion that their salaries ought to be increased to some extent. If the amendment should obtain, as offered by the gentleman from South Carolina, it will ultimately increase the appropriation \$12,000,000. If the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia should obtain, it will increase the appropriation \$4,000,000, and will increase the salary of each rural route carrier to the amount of \$100 a year. On yesterday this House, in my judgment, did some splendid legislation for the relief of a deserving class of postal employees, the railway postal clerks, and, going back a few years ago, Congress began then to look after the interest of that class of employees by increasing their salary, and at the same time taking care of the relatives of the deceased by paying to the personal representative \$1,000. cently that amount of money was doubled. Yesterday the House undertook to take care of that class of men by looking after the cars in which they are engaged at work, and the legislation that the House enacted will redound to their special interest and give more protection and benefit to that class of people. Here is a class of people that the Congress of the United States has not looked after so carefully, and that is the ruralroute carrier, and of all the class of men now in the Post Office Department that class of men reach more people than any class of people in the Postal Department can reach.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question? Mr. COX of Indiana. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has suggested there ought to be some increase in the salaries of the rural free-delivery carriers, and I agree with him in that. The gentleman has suggested an increase of \$100 a year. As far as I am concerned, if I can feel any assurance there will be an increase of \$100 a year at this time, and only \$100 a year, I would not make any point of order upon the paragraph or upon the proposition.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I think that can be arranged.

Mr. FINLEY. We will accept that and stand by it. This side of the House will accept that.

Mr. KENDALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. For a question,

Mr. KENDALL. I have not any question, but I was about to say I hope the gentlemen who have presented amendments to increase the salaries will accept the proposition of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. May I interrupt in the time of the gentleman?

We will get it extended. Mr. MANN.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment I offered was to increase the amount appropriated \$100 for each rural carrier according to the number reported by the Postmaster General in the hearings before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. Of course I was aware that would not necessarily authorize and compel the Postmaster General to pay it. I was in hopes, however, if the House did adopt my amendment increasing the amount sufficient to give each carrier \$100 a year in addition to what he is now receiving, to wit, \$000, making the salary \$1,000 per an-

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Indiana be extended five minutes, as we have taken up his time.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous con-

sent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. COX of Indiana. The rural-route service has done more to develop this country than any other service ever inaugurated by the Government. It has annihilated distance, brought the country and the great cities, the centers of trade and commerce, in close touch with each other. It has disseminated knowledge and information throughout the land. It keeps in touch the great bodies of consumers and producers living in cities and the country. In short, the rural-route service is a schoolhouse on wheels, and this class of men, through storm and sunshine, heat and cold, braving the elements of peril and danger, continue their ever-increasing labor, conveying this information throughout the land, and for myself, I willingly vote for this small increase of salary. The carriers in cities, with no expense whatever and working much shorter hours, receive salaries from \$900 to \$1,200 per year. Why not recognize the modest demand for this small increase, and let them have it?

Mr. Chairman, in this connection I can not refrain from saying a few things in regard to the establishment of rural delivery routes. There are now a little over 41,000 rural routes in operation, and many hundreds of petitions are now pending in the department undisposed of. Why? Is it in the interest of econ-omy, or can it be possibly due to the fact that the present Postmaster General is opposed to a further extension of this service? I trust not to the latter fact. Yet Congress appropriated nearly \$2,000,000 to further this service, but the Postmaster General has persistently refused to obey the mandates of Congress, and in the interest of economy or some other motive has refused to

expend the money thus appropriated.

Mr. Chairman, every dollar is appropriated in this bill to carry the mail to the door of people living in cities from three to eight deliveries each day, with an army of letter carriers engaged in carrying this mail to the door of people living in cities, while the country fellow only asks one delivery each working day of the week, and failure to go ahead and complete this work is denying to the people living in the country equal and exact justice. Last year we were told that the department could not do this work for lack of money; in answer to this Congress then gave the department all the money needed for the work, but the department refused to expend it. Mr. Chairman, there is money enough in this bill to establish more than 1,600 routes for the coming year. Will they be established? Let the department answer; the country will patiently wait, but if it does not establish these routes, the responsibility will rest on the department and not on Congress

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. May I interrupt the gentleman

further?

Mr. COX of Indiana. You may. Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I was in hopes that if that amendment was adopted the chairman of the Post Office Committee would permit the House to adopt an amendment fixing these salaries after July 1, 1911, at \$1,000.

Mr. COX of Indiana. By law?

Mr. COX of Indiana. By law?
Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. By law.
Mr. MANN. Of course it would be subject to a point of order, and the only way to do it would be to fix it all at once.
Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I would be content to have it fixed by law at \$1,000. That is an increase of \$100 a year.
Mr. COX of Indiana. If it increased by \$100, it ought to be

increased by law, against which no point of order could be raised whatever at all in the future. Congress would know in the future what the salary of the rural-route carrier would be, and the committee would be in a position to make its appropriations accordingly.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I understand there are some

other gentlemen who are very anxious to be heard first on the proposition, and when they are ready we can come to an agree-

ment, I think, without difficulty.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I hope they will come to their agreement without further discussion. If we can get the agreement, it will be worth more than all the talk we can give to it. Mr. MANN. This would fix the law at \$1,000. Of course, next Congress can raise it as it pleases.

Mr. CLAYTON. I would agree to it upon the principle that if we can not get a whole loaf let us take what we can get.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I would like to say to the gentle-man from Indiana, in view of the fact that he is a member of the committee, I notice that the bill last year was increased \$1,215,000 by the House over the amount fixed in the bill as reported by the committee, increasing it from \$37,645,000 to Now, this year the committee recommends a re-70,000. What were the conditions developing which \$38,860,000. duction of \$70,000.

justified this reduction on the part of the committee?

Mr. COX of Indiana. The amount of money that was ap-

propriated last year was not used at all.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. The Postmaster General just refused to carry out the law. That is all there is to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Weeks], chairman of the committee, is recognized.

Mr. Weeks. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that

all Members have an opportunity to extend their remarks on this subject for five legislative days.

The Committee of the Whole can not grant that Mr. MANN. request. Of course, if it is done in the House, nobody will object to it.

Mr. WEEKS. I will make the request when we go into the

Mr. LANGLEY. Regardless of whether they have spoken on the bill or not?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, there are two propositions that have been discussed on the floor this morning relating to this subject. One is the pay of rural carriers and the other is the extension of rural routes. Gentlemen have complained because the money that was appropriated last year, not for the pay of carriers but for the extensions of routes, has not been entirely spent. That is true. Neither was the entire amount appropriated for other purposes entirely spent, but there are reasons that would appeal, I think, to sane men why the Government should be and has been careful in its expenditures during the last 18 months. Everybody knows that the Treasury is in more or less distress, and while this is not the entire reason or only reason, it is true that the administration has directed that expenditures, and especially expenditures for new purposes, should be limited as far as possible

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. May I interrupt the gentleman just a second to call his attention to the fact that the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, before his committee, in giving the reason why this service was not extended, said that-

There has not been any lack of funds.

You evidently misunderstood me.

Mr. WEEKS. If the gentleman from Georgia had listened to me, I stated when I commenced my remarks that there had been sufficient funds appropriated, but we simply appropriate money, the department spends it; and it is fair to say for the department, while it has provided for the service that was already established, as it should, it has not extended this service for several reasons, one for economical reasons, but another reason is because the star-route service has recently been transferred to the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General's office. There has been more or less conflict between the star-route and the rural-delivery services, and as soon as possible after bringing them together investigations have been made which have resulted in showing where some part of the service could be cut out. In one section \$56,000 has been saved in the star-route service by bringing about this consolidation.

And they have just commenced. It is probable that a large amount of money can be saved in similar cases. But there are The routes are not as good as they were origother reasons. inally. At first they found 150 and sometimes 200 families on a standard route. Now the average number in an application is 75 to 100 families. Unless the carrier collects and delivers 5,000 pieces of mail in a month, it is not considered a first-class route. In many of these cases they have taken time to find out whether it was desirable that the route should be established.

Mr. BURNETT. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a

question?

Mr. WEEKS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURNETT. Will the gentleman state how many new routes were installed?

Mr. WEEKS. There were installed during the year ending June 30, 1910, 451 routes, net, and there were installed during the first five months of this year, up to the 30th of November, 153 routes.

Mr. BURNETT. Will the gentleman state how many of these

routes were installed in districts represented by Democrats?
Mr. WEEKS. I will. It is in the hearings. These 153 routes installed last year were in 37 different States; just as many in Democratic States as in Republican States, with the exception that the States of North Dakota and South Dakota had a very large portion of these new routes installed, for the reason that this section has been developing rapidly, and they have had less routes than other similar communities.

Mr. BURNETT. Does the gentleman state that the Record shows the districts that have gotten the new routes?

Mr. WEEKS. The States are given in the hearings, and I will put it in the RECORD if anybody wants it.

Mr. BURNETT. I would be very glad if the gentleman will do so.

The statement is as follows:

Arkansas, 1; California, 4; Colorado, 2; Connecticut, 3; Florida, 1; Georgia, 4; Idaho, 5; Illinois, 6; Indiana, 1; Iowa, 2; Kansas, 5; Louisiana, 4; Maine, 1; Maryland, 1; Massachusetts, 1; Michigan, 2; Minnesota, 5; Mississippl, 3; Missouri, 6; Montana, 1; Nernaka, 1; New Hampshire, 3; New York, 9; North Carolina, 4; North Dakota, 39; Ohio, 1; Oregon, 1; Pennsylvania, 3; South Carolina, 2; South Dakota, 16; Tennessee, 2; Texas, 3; Vermont, 1; Washington, 6; West Virginia, 1; Wisconsin, 2; and Wyoming, 1.

Mr. WEEKS. I would be glad to go on and continue my statement.

We have provided in this bill for the installation of 1,237 routes between the 1st of January this year and the 30th of next June. We have provided-

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 10 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to conclude his re-

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts may be permitted to proceed until he concludes his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WEEKS. We have provided in this bill for the conduct of the service as now established. We have provided for the of the service as now established. We have provided for the installation of 1,237 routes between the 1st of January this year and the 30th of June this year. We have provided for 1,000 additional routes between the 1st of July this year and the 1st of July, 1912, or we have made provision for 2,237 additional routes in 10,200 and 10,200 an tional routes in the next 18 months.

The committee has not recommended any change in the salaries of rural carriers. Last year we inserted in the bill a provision authorizing an investigation of this service, and asking the department to furnish the committee and Congress with suitable information on which to provide for a reorganization of the There is no doubt in the minds of anyone that some service. men in this service are performing their duties at a less salary

than they should receive.

There is no doubt in the minds of those who have investigated the subject that some men in this service are receiving all the salary the service they perform entitles them to. It is an uneven service. In all sections of the country the weather, the cost of feed, the condition of the roads affect the service. wish to say that where the roads are good, in a temperate climate, a man may cover his route in one-half the time that it requires in a mountainous section, where the roads are bad. In other words, what would be a fair compensation in a level country, with good roads and a temperate climate would be an unfair compensation in another section; and the committee has been unwilling to recommend a horizontal increase of these salaries. I sent an automobile in my own district over two routes. One of them was a route of 24 miles and the other a route of 22 miles. The automobile was not run over 20 miles an hour at any time. It easily covered these routes, two of them, in 3 hours and 40 minutes. A \$600 automobile would do that service.

If this service in many places were contracted, I am perfectly frank to say that, in my judgment, it could be done for three-fourths the money which the carriers are now receiving and the contractor would make money. On the other hand, in sections where automobile or motor-cycle service can not be performed, undoubtedly the carrier ought to receive additional

compensation.

who qualified.

Now, the committee has no disposition in making provision for this service to require men to work for less than their services entitle them to, provided the committee has the information on which to make changes; and to show that Congress has not been niggardly, I want to call the attention of this committee to the changes that have been made in this service in the last few years. In the first place, there were examined last year 18,894 men, of whom 17,966 passed their examination, and there were 4,473 appointments, or less than 25 per cent of those

We have been increasing the salaries of these men pretty rapidly since this service was established. They commenced at a salary of \$150 a year in 1896. In 1897 they were raised to \$300 a year, in 1898 to \$400, in 1901 to \$500, in 1904 to \$600, in 1907 to \$720, and two years ago to \$900 a year. I think the earlier salaries were entirely inadequate, and the service has been extended so that it has satisfied the needs of the people living along the routes; but it is absolutely impracticable to extend this service without any limitation. If we did the logical thing, we ought to serve every householder in this country through a rural route. It is just as logical to say that you shall serve a man living 25 miles from a post office, when there are no people living between, as it is to serve a man living 25 miles from a post office with 100 families living between the two points. In other words, we can not extend this service to a point where it would cost hundreds of millions of dollars. There must be some stopping place, and the stopping place of the department has been that a route should have 100 families living on it and that there should be 5,000 pieces of mail delivered and collected per month. That has been the standard. The standard is not as high as it was when the routes were originally established. There has been a letting down of the

standards, so that routes could be established where applica-

judgment there is no disposition on the part of the department to throttle or to cripple this service, but there is a disposition to make the Post Office Department self-sustaining, and there is a disposition also to take into account the condition of the Treasury when we extend a service on which we know we are going to lose a portion of every dollar that we extend it.

But after considering this whole matter with the Post Office Committee, and getting the sentiments of men on both sides of the House, I am prepared to offer an amendment to the bill as

proposed, in this form:

On page 30, line 16, after the word "dollars," insert: "Provided further, That on and after July 1, 1911, letter carriers of the Rural Delivery Service shall receive a salary not exceeding \$1,000 per annum."

That is in exactly the same language that was used when the last increase was made, from \$720 to \$900. And I intend to offer this amendment on lines 15 and 16 on page 30: To strike out "\$38,790,000" and insert "\$42,790,000," which would provide the additional money for paying this increase. I send these amendments to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman that his amendment is not offered at quite the better place. It should be after the

word "substations," in line 18.

Mr. STAFFORD. I should like to say to the gentleman from Illinois that we propose to insert it at the same place where it was inserted when the last increase was made.

Mr. MANN. To insert a substantive proposition in between

the appropriation and the proviso is rhetorically bad.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. This will allow the Postmaster General then to fix the salaries of the rural carriers as he does at present.

Mr. WEEKS. On standard routes at \$1,000 a year.

Mr. GARNER of Texas rose.

Mr. WEEKS. I will yield to the gentleman from Texas. Mr. GARNER of Texas. The gentleman from Massachusetts states that provision is made for about 2,200 routes

Mr. WEEKS. Two thousand two hundred and thirty-seven routes between the 1st of January of this year and the 30th of June, 1912.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Has the gentleman any assurance that the Post Office Department will take into consideration the wishes of Congress any more than it has in the past?

Mr. WEEKS. The Fourth Assistant Postmaster General in the hearings stated that it was the intention of the department to install these routes.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. WEEKS. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COX of Indiana. For the purpose of getting at the permanent effect of the amendment offered by the chairman, I want to call his attention to the permanent law of 1907. I want to state that I am in accord with the amendment. The law of 1907, on which the salaries of the rural carriers are now based, is substantially the language of the amendment—that is, the gentleman's amendment as read, I see, complies literally with that act of 1907 down to the first proviso. Now, what does the gentleman think of his own amendment, whether or not it will take care of the substitute letter carriers who are carrying the mail for the rural carriers who are sick? In other words, if the gentleman's amendment obtains, will it be broad enough to take care of that part of the service?

Mr. MANN. That is permanent law, and it will remain the

Mr. WEEKS. I do not think this amendment will change that provision.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Whether or not in the gentleman's opinion it will not repeal it?

Mr. MANN. It would not affect the rest of the act at all. Mr. WEEKS. I do not think it would affect it

Mr. FINLEY rose.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FINLEY. I merely wish to ask a question, not for myself, but to satisfy some other people. This amendment would in no way interfere with the annual leave of the rural carriers

as now provided by law?

Mr. WEEKS. Not at all.

Mr. FINLEY. Of course it is not the intention of Congress to interfere with it or take it away.

Mr. OLMSTED. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield for a question?

Mr. WEEKS. Certainly.

Mr. OLMSTED. Will the proposed amendment increase the salaries of all the rural carriers;

Mr. WEEKS. The carrier of the standard route will receive tions have gone in and inspections have been made. In my not exceeding \$1,000.

Mr. OLMSTED. What is a standard route?

Mr. WEEKS. Not less than 24 miles.

Mr. OLMSTED. Will it give the man on a 20-mile route or a shorter route any increase?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes; a proportionate increase.

Mr. OLMSTED. Then it affects the salaries of all the rural carriers—increases them all. I am in favor of its passage, and hope that the point of order may be withdrawn and the amendment agreed to.

Mr. WEEKS.

Will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield Mr. LEVER. for a question?

Mr. WEEKS. Certainly.

Mr. LEVER. I did not quite catch the reading of the amendment. Does it give the Postmaster General any discretion as to fixing the salary below \$1,000? That is, does it make it mandatory on the Postmaster General to pay \$1,000?

Mr. WEEKS. It is exactly the same form of legislation that was used before when the salaries were increased in 1908.

Mr. LEVER. Does the present law make it mandatory to pay \$900?

Mr. WEEKS. I think so.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I will read the present law.

On and after July 1, 1907, rural letter carriers shall receive a salary not exceeding \$900 per annum.

Mr. LEVER. That does not seem to me to make it man-

Mr. MANN. It is practically mandatory; no officer would disregard it.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to

ask the gentleman from Massachusetts a question. Mr. WEEKS. I will yield to the gentleman from Georgia. Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I understand the gentleman's

amendment follows the language of the act of 1907 and will authorize the Postmaster General to pay \$1,000 to a carrier who is carrying the rural mail upon a route of maximum length.

Mr. WEEKS. Yes; a standard route.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. If that amendment is adopted, the gentleman proposes to follow it by a provision in the bill so that on the 1st of July, 1911, there will be appropriated by Congress enough money to give the rural carriers \$100 additional to the salary they now receive.

Mr. WEEKS. I have sent to the desk an amendment which

adds \$4,000,000 to the amount appropriated.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. The amendment I offered

carries \$4,000,000 additional.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that the intention of the chairman of the committee is to increase this salary to \$1,000, but we all know that under this amendment, if adopted, the Postmaster General could continue to pay only

Several Members. Oh, no! Oh, no! Mr. HAMLIN. Yes; he could. This says he shall pay not exceeding \$1,000. He could still refuse to pay \$1,000 and pay \$900 as a maximum rate.

Now, would the gentleman accept an amendment which provides that we shall pay salaries on the maximum routes of \$1,000 and shorter routes in proportion?

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I will not accept any amendment on this proposition. It is in exactly the same form that the law has been in since the service was established.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to state that if the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts is adopted I shall of course withdraw the one that I offered and that is now pending.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman-

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. MANN. I rise on the point of order.
The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.
Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire whether the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts is satisfactory to these gentlemen who have amendments pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not hear the gentleman

from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I was addressing my remarks to

the gentlemen on the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to state that several gentlemen have asked unanimous consent to address the committee. The Chair has informed the committee that debate has been proceeding by unanimous consent. The list on the desk has not been exhausted, and the Chair will therefore, by unanimous consent, recognize the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS 1.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to again announce that when we go into the House I shall ask unanimous consent that Members have opportunity to extend their remarks in the RECORD for a period of five days upon this subject.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to address my remarks to the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order if the gentleman from Illinois insists on the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I am trying to ascertain whether the rules of the House would require the item to go out on a point of order, and for that purpose I was trying to obtain some information from Members upon the floor.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I will say to him that so far as my own amendment is conconcerned, they are down and out if he will accept the Weeks

amendment.

Mr. MANN. There were some amendments on this side of the House also. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Weeks] is agreeable, I withdraw my point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws his point of order, and the gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be

again reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, line 18, after the word "substation," insert:
"And provided further, That on and after July 1, 1911, letter carriers
of the Rural Delivery Service shall receive a salary not exceeding
\$1,000 per annum."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Lines 15 and 16, page 30, strike out the words "thirty-eight million seven hundred and ninety thousand" and insert "forty-two million seven hundred and ninety thousand."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amend-

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I now withdraw the amendment which I sent to the desk.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Massachusetts a question. I understood the gentleman to say in his remarks a moment ago that he had provided in this bill for the moneys for the installation of over 1,200 routes between the first of this year and the 30th of June.

Mr. WEEKS. One thousand two hundred and thirty-seven. Mr. HAWLEY. And about a thousand the next fiscal year. Mr. WEEKS. Exactly 1,000.

Mr. HAWLEY. Is it understood that the department will expend the money and establish these routes?

Mr. WEEKS. The department expects to do that now.
Mr. HAWLEY. And not hold them up as it has in the past?
Mr. WEEKS. The department hopes it will not have the reason to withhold the installing the routes it has had in the past.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. When, after a weighing of the mails for the purpose of readjusting the compensation for their transportation on a railroad route, mails are diverted therefrom or thereto, the Postmaster General may, in his discretion, ascertain the effect of such diversion by a weighing of such mails for such number of successive working days as he may determine, and have the weights stated and verified to him as in other cases, and readjust the compensation on the routes affected accordingly: Provided, That no readjustment shall be made unless the diverted mails equal at least 10 per cent of the average daily weight on any of the routes affected: Provided further, That the cost to the Government shall not be increased by such readjustment.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. WEEKS. I will ask the gentleman to reserve his point of order.

Mr. LAMB. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to explain to the committee the purpose of this paragraph, which I admit is new legislation and out of order. I think it is in line with good administration that this be included in the bill. Very frequently during a four years' term for which a railroad has a contract to carry the mails certain portions of the mails are transferred to some other line.

If this is done the lines to which the mail is transferred can not receive any pay for it unless the department has this authority to reweigh and give them credit for the mails which they are carrying. There have been cases where the transfer from one line to another amount to as much as 25 per cent of the total mails carried by the road having the original contract. The pay continues to the road having the original centract, and the road which is handling the business receives no additional compensation. This change would not add to the expense of this service a dollar. It simply provides that the money shall be raid to the railroad company which is doing the work.

Mr. LAMB. Now, Mr. Chairman, this provision would work

a hardship and an injustice to many of these carriers, and in addition to that it would lodge authority in the hands of the Postmaster General that I do not think he ought to have. But, Mr. Chairman, it is useless at this hour to discuss the merits of this paragraph, for I am sure it will go out on the

point of order I have raised.

Mr. FINLEY. Will the gentleman permit? Mr. LAMB. Certainly.

Mr. FINLEY. If the gentleman will read the language carefully he will ascertain that unless there has been a diversion of mail from one road to another exceeding 10 per cent-

Mr. LAMB. I note that.

Mr. FINLEY (continuing). Then the Postmaster General has no authority to readjust the pay. Now, on some roads there is a diversion of the mail during a four-year period between the time it is weighed and the time it is weighed again amounting to a great deal, in many instances to 20 or 30 per cent of the whole mail. Now, it is not right to continue the pay to the road on which the mail was weighed during the weighing period when that road is no longer performing that service and when another road is performing the service and getting not one cent for that service. I submit to the gentleman from Virginia that this is a fair proposition and it is right that such road should receive pay for its service.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Is it not also true that because of the lack of authority in the Postmaster General to do this thing

suits are now being waged for relief in this matter?

Mr. FINLEY. Yes.
Mr. LAMB. I think, Mr. Chairman, it is clearly demonstrable it would work an injustice to the road when the department can call for a weighing at any time and reweigh these malls, which is fixed at a period of four years. They have 90 days to weigh it, and rates are fixed thereby.

Mr. FINLEY. But the gentleman must admit mails are diverted and properly, for instance, by a new road built which takes a large amount of the mail carried by another road, and No injustice can be done to the railroad. I do not think the gentleman from Virginia would want to pay a road

for work that it has not performed.

Mr. LAMB. No; assuredly not. But I want this work done as it has formerly been done under the law, and it has worked, I am informed, well. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is new legislation, and that this report of the committee admits it is new legislation, and it is therefore subject

to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, and the

Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That section 211 of an act of Congress entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909, be amended by adding thereto the following: And the term "indecent" within the intendment of this section shall include matter of a character tending to incite arson, murder, or assassination.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last I suggest to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the addition ought to be made in quotations. There ought to be quotation marks inserted before the word "and" in line 18 and after the word "assassination" in line 20, so there would be no question about the authority being added to a criminal

Mr. WEEKS. That was copied from what is originally in the criminal statute. There is no reason why it should not the criminal statute. be put in quotations.

Mr. MANN. When you are adding an item to the criminal statutes it should be quoted to make it perfectly certain.

Mr. WEEKS. I have no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to insert quotation marks before the word "and" in line 18 and after the word "assassination" in line 20.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk rend as follows:

On page 31, insert quotation marks before the word "and" in line 18 and after the word "assassination" in line 20.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Is not this a rather extraordinary way in which to amend a separate act of Congress which had for its object the punishment of crime and nothing

Mr. WEEKS, I think it is, Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin (continuing). Right in the midst of a bill appropriating for the Post Office Department for the next fiscal year, and for other purposes, without the slightest indication in the title? It seems to me that nobody would have any knowledge whatever, unless he was a perfect delver in the legislation of Congress, that we were amending another statute so entirely distinct both as to subject matter and phraseology

Mr. WEEKS. I think, Mr. Chairman, the suggestion made by the gentleman from Wisconsin is quite correct—that it is

an extraordinary proposition.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. But is it a safe way to legis-

Mr. WEEKS. I do not think it is a safe way to legislate ordinarily, but this paragraph was left out of the criminal code. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moon] is here and he will make a statement about it. He has introduced a bill to do exactly the same thing, and it seems particularly desirable that this be put back in the criminal code.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It seems to be particularly desirable, if it be put in the law in this debate in the midst of a statute where nobody will discover it unless somebody would call specific attention to it. Will not the gentleman from Penn-

sylvania [Mr. Moon] bring in this measure?

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. I will state that it was a pure inadvertence and oversight. It was passed in 1908 as an amendment to the then existing law, and in order to cure it I have already introduced a bill which is pending before the Judiciary Committee. I do not apprehend any difficulty in getting that bill favorably reported, and I would not imagine there would exist any difficulty on the floor of this House in having it go through by unanimous consent.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I do not think there could be

any possibility of there being objection.

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that it is a better method of accomplishing the

purpose.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania, upon whose judgment we so confidently rely, would it not only be a better method but is it not the only proper method?

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. I think there is only one answer to that question, which is that it is the only proper

Mr. WEEKS. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that it is perfectly safe to leave it in this bill and be sure that it is reinstated in the law. There may be some possibility that the bill that has been introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moon] may not be acted on, and it is very essential to the department that it be included in the criminal law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered

by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 4. That the Postmaster General shall cause to be prepared and furnish, under such regulations as he may prescribe, official postage stamps, stamped envelopes, wrappers, address slips, and postal cards for use within the limitations of existing law, by all officers of the United States and other persons authorized by law to transmit mail matter free of postage; and after July 1, 1911, no such officer or person shall transmit any matter free by mail without affixing stamps or using stamped paper herein authorized to the equivalent in face value of the legal postage on the matter transmitted.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill just what this means, or if he has been able to learn what it means. I notice it says:

That the Postmaster General shall cause to be prepared and furnish, under such regulations as he may prescribe, official postage stamps, stamped envelopes, wrappers, address slips, and postal cards for use within the limitations of existing law.

What provision is there now under which Members of Congress would receive stamps?

Mr. WEEKS. There is no provision under which they would receive stamps, but there is a provision under which they would be entitled to the franking privilege.

Mr. MANN. Very well. Mr. WEEKS. And it is the purpose of this legislation that hereafter the Postmaster General shall provide and shall issue to Members of Congress and to the department stamps which shall be used in exactly the same way that other stamps are used, the Post Office Department keeping an account with other departments and Members of Congress as to the number of stamps they use, so that we may determine just what it is cost-

ing to carry franked and penalty mail.

Yes; but there is no limitation of existing law now which authorizes the furnishing of postage stamps. there any provision of law which now authorizes the furnishing of envelopes free to Members of Congress?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes, Mr. MANN. Where is that law? I would like to find it.

Mr. WEEKS. We have an allowance for stationery.
Mr. MANN We have an allowance under which we buy

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. There is only one provision in the printing law for that, and that is in Government envelopes for sending out the RECORD. It is not general. It is only

a limited way.

Mr. MANN. I understand. There is no provision of law furnishing Members free envelopes. We buy them. Do I understand under this provision we would get envelopes free at the Government expense? Is that the purpose of the proposition?

Mr. WEEKS. The purpose of the proposition, Mr. Chairman, is that the same regulation, at least the same application of the franking privilege, shall be extended to the use of stamps and other means of forwarding mail matter, so that we may be able to determine just exactly how much it costs for that

purpose.

Well, the gentleman now talks about his desire, not what the language indicates. I take it we construe language according to what we see, not according to what we hope. Now, where is the provision of law authorizing the furnishing of individual Members with official postage stamps, stamped envelopes, wrappers, addressed slips, postal cards, and so forth?

WEEKS. This paragraph was prepared by the law officer of the Post Office Department and has been pretty carefully considered by the committee. The gentleman has not read it carefully or he would not make that comment.

Mr. MANN. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I have read it 17 times, which is more than any member of the committee has read it, trying to find out what it meant, and was not able to tell; therefore I asked the gentleman, whom I admit is better able to judge what it means than I am.

Mr. WEEKS. I will try to explain [reading]:

The Postmaster General shall cause to be prepared and furnish, under such regulations as he may prescribe, official postage stamps, stamped envelopes, wrappers, address slips, and postal cards for use within the limitations of existing law.

The limitation of existing law is the franking privilege, which may be used for Government matter; that a department may use the penalty mail provision for use in distributing governmental matter. It does not mean that there is any existing law for the issuing of these official stamps, but that they may be issued and may be used, as now provided under the franking privilege, and under the penalty provision of the existing

Mr. MANN. Is that what it says? Mr. WEEKS. That is what it means. Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise just now to say, if the gentleman from Illinois does not make the point of order I

will reserve it now and make it later.

Mr. MANN. I wish to make no reflection on anybody, and omitting any further argument as to what it means, may I ask the gentleman this: Under the existing condition, a Member of Congress has every protection against the use of his frank illegally. You are able to tell when you receive a frank whose frank it is; but if you receive postage stamps, what protection has the Government or the Member of Congress against the

fraudulent use of those stamps?

Mr. WEEKS. Well, it is intended that Members of Congress shall be responsible for these stamps as they are for their franks. It is not contended that occasionally the frank is not used by somebody improperly; but the Member of Congress must make such provision as he finds necessary to protect the

Government against the misuse of these stamps.

Why should he? There is no way to trace it. Mr. MANN. Why should he give as much attention to the putting on of the stamps when there is no way of tracing the matter as there

is with a frank? The frank traces itself.
Mr. WEEKS. But, Mr. Chairman, Members of Congress are honest men and are not using their franks improperly and

would not use the stamps improperly.

Mr. MANN. Anyone could go up to my committee room and could use my frank without my knowing it, but if it is used it is traced to me; but if anybody gets these stamps, who can trace them?

Mr. WEEKS. One could keep his stamps under lock and key.

Mr. MANN. I do not put the stamps I buy from the department under lock and key. The gentleman is more careful

I assume that Members will receive stamps enough for possibly three months. They can make requisition for any amount ar I take any action they care to to protect them. It will be shown at the end of the year just how many stamps each Member has used.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the same stamps be used on a letter

as on a public document?

Mr. WEEKS. Probably.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

All laws and parts of laws now in force for the punishment of offenders against the laws authorizing the use of penalty envelopes and official franks are hereby extended and made applicable to the use of the stamps and stamped paper herein authorized, as to all persons now subject to punishment for the unauthorized use of penalty envelopes or official franks.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order against that. The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. That hereafter for services required on Sundays of supervisory officers, clerks in first and second class post offices, and city letter carriers, compensatory time off during working days in amount equal to that of the Sunday employment may be allowed, under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe; but this provision shall not apply to auxiliary or substitute employees.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer the

amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting, on page 32, after section 5, in line 20, the fol-

lowing:

"That hereafter clerks and carriers at first-class offices shall be promoted successively to the sixth grade, and clerks and carriers at second-class offices shall be promoted successively to the fifth grade."

Mr. WEEKS. I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the sole purpose of this amendment is to make the promotion of clerks in first-class offices successive until they reach the maximum salary, and the same with regard to clerks in second-class offices, until they reach the maximum salary. As it is at the present time, there is a successive promotion in first-class offices until the fifth grade is reached, and then when it comes to promotion to the sixth grade there is naturally a discrimination. There must be a selection of those who are promoted from the fifth grade to the sixth grade. There is a good sound reason why these promotions should take place for the welfare of the service to the fifth grade, and the same reason applies to promotions to the sixth grade. That is also true of the promotions in the classes from the first to the fifth grade in second-class The simple purpose of the amendment as presented is to provide for those successive promotions.

Mr. WEEKS. I make the point of order against the amend-

ment, that it changes existing law and is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order; not that it changes existing law, but that it is not germane to the paragraph.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after line 20, page 32, the following as a new section:
"After June 30, 1911, where the salary or compensation of any employee in the postal service is at an annual or monthly rate the following rules shall be followed in computing the amount due: An annual salary or compensation shall be divided into 12 equal installments, one of which shall be the pay for each calendar month; and in making payment for a fractional part of any calendar month there shall be paid such proportion of one of such installments, or of the amount of the monthly salary or compensation, as the number of days in the fractional part of that month bears to the actual number of days in that month."

Mr. FITZGERALD. This proposed amendment has received the approval of the department, and is desired by all the employees in the department. It reestablishes the old method of computing the compensation for the employees of the department for specific days in each month, and it is satisfactory to everybody interested, and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. WEEKS. I did not understand what the gentleman from New York said, but—

Mr. FITZGERALD. I said it was perfectly satisfactory to the department and to the employees.

Mr. WEEKS. I have referred this matter to the department, and it has the approval of the department.

The question being taken, the amendment was agreed to. Mr. CARY. I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert, after line 20, page 32, the following:
"Provided, That hereafter all clerks and carriers in the first and second class post offices shall be allowed extra compensation for all time worked in excess of eight hours on any working-day, such extra compensation to be at the regular rate of pay of said clerk or carrier."

Mr. WEEKS. I make a point of order against that amend-

Mr. CARY. I trust the chairman will reserve the point of order.

Mr. WEEKS. Has the gentleman from Wisconsin a statement to make?

I have, but do not wish to delay this bill. Mr. CARY.

The post-office clerks are practically the only civil-service employees of the Government that have not the protection of a law regulating their hours of labor. The departmental clerks, the mechanics, and laborers employed in the various departments and bureaus all have legislative regulation of their hours of employment. The letter carriers have the benefit of some regulation in that the law provides they shall not be required to work in excess of 48 hours in any one week. There has been sufficient legislation on the subject of hours of labor of Government employees to demonstrate that it is the desire of Congress that the Government shall be a model employer, at least to the extent that it shall uphold among its own employees the principle of an eight-hour day.

The post-office clerks, who beyond question are among the most skilled and the hardest worked employees of the Government, have no such legalized regulation of their hours of labor. As a consequence, these painstaking and diligent workers have been and are being required to work long hours without extra compensation, hours far in excess of eight per day, and during the holiday rush and at election time, when the mail is voluminous, oftentimes these workers, who the outside public see very little of, toil at their tasks for periods as much as 14 hours a day in order that the mail may be speedily dispatched.

But a small percentage of the public are at all familiar with the duties of a post-office clerk-they know nothing at all as to how the letter or newspaper deposited in the corner mail box reaches its destination; they know nothing beyond the fact that a mail carrier opens the box and collects the letter and that a mail carrier delivers the same at its destination. They know nothing of the skilled hand and the efficient brain that directs and dispatches the letter to the proper train upon which it is to travel and who directs it to the carrier who serves the district to which it belongs. That is the work of the post-office

It is the post-office clerk who, after doing a day's work of eight and one-half, nine, or 10 hours in the post office amidst the dust and dirt brought into the office on sacks and pouches that have been dragged over the railroad depot platforms of this country, who has to retire to his home and spend, on the average, an hour or more a day studying the various distributing schemes which enable him to know what county this or that town is located in, what train passes through that or the other town, what time all these trains leave, and when distributing mail for the city what carrier serves this street or that street. post-office clerk who must keep posted on all the changes in name of towns, train schedules, removals of firms and individuals, and it is the post-office clerk who must know the classification of mails and the postage rates. But, despite the fact that all this is required of him, the public knows little of his duties, and he is the one class of our public employees that have no legal regulation of hours of work.

Most of the work of these clerks is done at night, which is due to the fact that about the last thing a business house does at the close of the day is to send its mail to the post office, and then again the mail arriving on trains at night, no matter what the hour, must be distributed in time for delivery the first thing in the morning. Working the unnatural hours of night, under the severe mental and physical strain they do, makes a post-office clerk's job not the most desirable vocation that could be selected, when the conditions and pay attached to the position are considered.

The service rendered by the letter carrier is known and appreciated to some extent by the public because the public comes in contact with him, and there are none who will dispute the fact that in the letter carriers we have as loyal and efficient a set of men as anywhere in the Government service. or in the employ of any commercial or industrial concern, but the post-office clerks are equally as loyal and are working out of sight of the public eye and under unfavorable conditions as compared with the carrier. Because they are unseen and

because of executive orders that forbid them from attempting to influence legislation and making their wants known we have heard little of them.

The post-office clerk and letter carrier, after waiting a long period of time on the substitute list for appointment, during which time they receive only what salary they make in acting in the place of absentees, come into the service with the intention of making it their life's work, and after a few years spent in such service they are equal in skill and knowledge to the skilled mechanics of the various skilled trades, who today in large cities, where cost of living is high, receive a wage far in excess of what we pay our postal employees. We should give recognition to these faithful servants and endeavor to keep them in the service by providing favorable working con-

The passage of this amendment will help toward that end. It provides for the regulation of their hours of duty in such a way that when the Postmaster General seeks to economize on the expenditures in the department that the clerks will be protected against having all of the economy taken at the expense of his working conditions, by the working of overtime and long hours in an effort to save on the appointment of a few clerks.

The First Assistant Postmaster General states in his hearing before the committee (p. 94) that provisions in the bill for clerk hire are sufficient to take care of increased business and maintain an eight-hour schedule for the clerks.

Congress passed a law about 20 years ago providing that letter carriers should not work more than eight hours any one day. This was in effect up to the year 1900, when a proviso was carried in the appropriation bill which provided that letter carriers could be worked not to exceed 48 hours in any week. This allows of working them 10 or 11 hours on some days and then at the latter part of the week cutting down their time so as not to exceed 48 hours. After the year 1900 the carriers were worked on the basis of the old straight eight-hour law until the present Postmaster General brought a test case into the Court of Claims and won a decision that the proviso carried in the appropriation bill of 1900 was permanent law. Now, the carriers are working on the 48-hour-a-week basis. The clerks have neither the 48-hour law nor the straight eight-hour law to protect them.

If the First Assistant Postmaster General is correct in his statement "that clerks will be provided in this bill to maintain an eight-hour schedule," why should anyone object to the passage of the amendment?

I have here some reports of the different branch post offices in the city of Milwaukee, and will state that the clerks worked overtime in all of them. For instance, station C for month of October the average was 8 hours and 15 minutes per day; West Allis Substation, 9 hours and 35 minutes; stations B and D for December are about the same, 9 hours and 37 minutes. and they should be paid for this extra work.

I was more than pleased to-day to see that Congress has finally recognized the fact that the rural mail carriers need more salary, especially when you take into consideration the great expense of keeping at least two horses and as many buggies or wagons. While \$100 a year is not as much as I would like to see them get, yet it is some increase and a step in the right direction. Now, then, let us be fair with the clerks.

I do not believe in false economy by reducing wages or increasing the working hours.

With reference to the joint resolution 258, which I introduced in the House recently, will say that I believe the man in the Government employ drawing the small salary is as much, if not more, entitled to consideration and an increase in salary as is the man higher up drawing the greater salary. My reason for introducing the resolution at this time was brought about by the slicing or cutting being done on the salaries of the various employees of the Government and the rumors of more to come when instead they should have been increased.

It has always seemed peculiar to me that when a large concern or the Government attempts to economize they always start to economize on the poor wage-earner drawing the smallest salary, instead of starting at the top where they can better afford the reduction. As you know very well, the necessaries of life have increased in the last 10 or 15 years 50 per cent, and even more in some instances, and yet the increase in wages all over the country has not been over 10 per cent as an average. if that much. It certainly does seem to be a very strange action on the part of the Government that it, instead of advocating better times and more concessions for the poor man, should take the opposite view by depriving him of every bit of ambition that is in him by keeping his wages down to a margin that he can scarcely support himself and his family in any sort of comfort. I believe that the Government should set a precedent in this direction for increase of wages; it can not but ultimately bring about similar changes where private enterprise is interested. We are each year spending vast sums for a great many other things which the Nation evidently needs, but we are neglecting those who comprise the working forces of the many governmental agencies. If there would be a way to reduce liv-ing expenses, say, 50 per cent, there might be some excuse for reducing the wage-earner's salary, say, 10 per cent, which would put him on a more equal basis and in a better position to eat properly, wear decent clothes, and educate his children.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. That the Postmaster General is hereby authorized, in cases where the mail service would be thereby improved, to extend service on a mail route under contract at not exceeding pro rata additional pay: Provided, That the extensions beyond either terminus ordered during a contract term shall not, in the aggregate, exceed 25 miles.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order I would like to ask the chairman a question or two. Do I understand that this is the beginning of an undertaking or a plan to carry the mail by contract?

Mr. WEEKS. I do not understand that it has anything to do with that kind of a purpose. There are cases where the Postmaster General has desired to extend a star route, but he has to advertise before this can be done. This section would permit him to extend the route without advertising.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Why does the distance to which it could be extended-25 miles-correspond with the standard rural

Mr. WEEKS. I do not know. It does not say extend it to

25 miles, but it says extend it 25 miles.

Mr. TOWNSEND. At the present time I am very much opposed to changing the rural-route system to a contract system. I do not think we ought to do anything that would indicate that we are at all favorable to that plan until there can be a wider discussion and better understanding of this subject. It seems to me rural service by contract may be what this means, and while possibly it might be convenient in some cases to give the Postmaster General this discretion, at the same time it occurs to me that possibly undesirable changes might come from it which would warrant me in making this point of

Mr. WEEKS. I think the fears of the gentleman from Michigan are not well founded. This is to extend a star route not exceeding 25 miles. It does not mean that the entire route shall be 25 miles in length. Since these two services have been brought together into the same bureau there has been no cutting out except in the star-route service. Fifty-six thousand dollars have been saved in this way in the third contract section. I do not think there is any intention on the part of the department to take advantage of what the gentleman from Michigan has in mind.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I made the point of order for the reason that I am apprehensive that this proposed section will be construed so as to authorize encroachments upon rural routes by the star route or contract service. If I felt that the provision merely authorizes extension of star routes to not exceeding 25 miles in length I should be content to let it remain in the bill; but I fear there is lurking in this proposition the possibility of a merger of the two services—contract and rural—in which event the older service—that is, the contract service-will be the gainer. I think I can readily see how that might be brought about in hands unfriendly or lukewarm toward the rural service, not to say that the gentlemen now at the head of the rural service have not the best interests of it at heart.

But inasmuch as the contract service is the cheaper and its substitution for the rural service was seriously advocated a few years ago on the ground of economy, I think we had better not put temptation in the way of the department at this time, when economy seems to have been practiced somewhat at the expense of the rural service. I think both services desirable, according to the needs of a particular locality. There are communities adapted to the contract service and where no other service is desired. Likewise, but in a majority of cases, the rural service is best adapted to the needs of the people and no other service is wanted. But a merger of both into one or the other would result in dissatisfaction, and I am opposed to anything tending toward such merger. The rural service is popular, and is here to stay. The sa certain localities. The same can be said of the star-route service in The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. That any post-office inspector or other representative of the Post Office Department commissioned by the Postmaster General, or any postmaster, assistant postmaster, or superintendent of a post-office division, branch office, or station, may administer ouths and take affidavits, without fee, in connection with any business relating to the postal

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order to this section. There is a part that I do not want to remain in.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of

order on the whole section.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 8. That in addition to the permissible marks, writing, and printing on mail matter of the third and fourth classes, respectively, or on the envelopes or packages containing them, as authorized by the act of Congress approved January 20, 1888, entitled "An act relating to permissible marks, printing, or writing, upon second, third, and fourth class matter, and to amend the twenty-second and twenty-third sections of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1880, and for other purposes," there may be placed on such mail matter, or on the package, wrapper, or envelope inclosing the same, or on a tag or label attached thereto, either in writing or otherwise, the words "Please do not open until Christmas," or words to that effect.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the chairman of the

committee if this is a compliment to Santa Claus.

Mr. WEEKS. The purpose of the provision is to prevent a congestion of mail at Christmas time. We all try to send our Christmas presents through the mail so that they will reach the recipient on Christmas or the day before. This brings about a great congestion in the mail, and it is hoped that if this provision is adopted the extra mail which is now carried two or three days before Christmas may be distributed over as many

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. It will serve to keep up the idea that Santa Claus will come on Christmas eve.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I want to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts, the chairman of the committee, if he would object to an amendment changing the present law so as to allow the Postmaster General, in cases where he believed it wise, to increase the assistant postmaster's salary to 75 per cent of the postmaster's salary, instead of 50 per cent, as at present.

Mr. WEEKS. I certainly should object to such an amend-

ment.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. I realize that it would be subject to the point of order, and therefore it would be useless to offer it; but I think such provision should be made.

Assistant postmasters in first-class offices are now paid not exceeding 50 per cent of the salary received by postmasters, in even hundreds of dollars. The postmaster at my home city, Huntington, W. Va., gets \$3,300, but his assistant only gets \$1,500, instead of \$1,600 or \$1,650, if the actual amount paid were 50 per cent of the amount of the postmaster's salary. If the amount that he could receive were fixed at not exceeding 75 per cent, or even 60 per cent, as recommended by the department, the greater latitude afforded would make it possible to do justice in meritorious cases, like that in my home city, by actually allowing a salary commensurate with the duties performed. The assistant postmaster at Huntington is often required by the exigencies of the service to remain on duty 18 hours a day.

Mr. Chairman, I have confined what remarks I have made to the bill under consideration, and have advocated the increase of salaries of clerks, city and rural carriers, and employees in the postal service generally, because I think such a policy would be just to those employees and wise from the standpoint of administrative policy. I also want to say a word in behalf of the clerks in the Post Office Department in this city, whose salaries are carried in another bill. They are equally entitled to consideration at our hands. I have found them efficient and industrious, and in my judgment they are worthy of more pay.

We have increased the pay of some of the higher officials in the last few years, but the rank and file have been overlooked. This is true of all of the departments in this city. It is a grave injustice to a splendid and faithful set of men and women. We increased our own salaries a few years ago on the ground of increased cost of living, but the salaries of Government clerks in the departments have remained the same as they have been for years. I would raise them all along the line from the charwomen up. What increases have been made in the higher grades were just and proper, but we have not gone deep enough down. Perhaps we started at the wrong end. My sympathy goes out to the fellow on the little salary, and I often wonder how he makes ends meet—the chances are he does not. Certain it is that he can not indulge in even the simplest forms of

diverting amusement, and not many of the plain necessities. The wonder is that we get good service at all. I generally vote to maintain every branch of the service, including the Army and Navy, and to increase their efficiency; but I should like to see a systematic effort put forth to effect real economies in the Government service in the matter of large lump-sum appropriations, with the understanding that the resulting savings should be applied upon an equitable basis to increasing the salaries of the faithful and underpaid servants in the public service in this city and throughout the country.

The Clerk proceeded with and completed the reading of the

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 12 of the bill, in order to make a change.
Mr. MANN. What is the paragraph?

Mr. MANN.

Mr. WEEKS. The paragraph commencing on line 20, page 12. It reads:

For compensation to watchmen, messengers, and laborers, 100 at \$800 each.

When this was passed a point of order was made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox], and he wishes now to withdraw the point of order.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I made the point of order against the increase of salary, and since then I have thought that I may have committed an error against a deserving class of people, and I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The first question is the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts to return to page 12 of the bill.

Is there objection?

There was no objection. Mr. WEEKS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I move to amend line 21, page 12, by inserting the words "100 at \$800 each."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 12, line 21, before the words "seven hundred," insert the words "100 at \$800 each."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the word "seven"—

Mr. COX of Indiana. If that is done, Mr. Chairman, I re-

new my point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the word "seven," in line 21, and the word "six," in line 22, and insert in lieu of the first word "seven" the word "thirteen," and all of the language after the word "six," so as to make it read "1,300 at \$700 acah," instead of "700 at \$700 each," and "600 at \$600 each."

Mr. MANN. This is not an amendment to the amendment, I

suggest to my colleague.

Mr. MADDEN. This is an independent amendment. I will let them vote first on the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I renew my original point of order if there are to be any more amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order

on the word "eight."

Mr. MANN. The point of order comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. It is too late, and the point of order is overruled. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, that in place of the word "seven," on line 21, the word "thirteen" shall be substituted—

Mr. COX of Indiana. I will reserve the point of order on

the amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. Wait until I offer the amendment. Strike out all after the word "and," line 22, down to and including the word "each" on line 23.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of

order on that.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, my motion was to recur to the paragraph under consideration and to limit it to the language which has just been reinserted in the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. That is what the gentleman asked unanimous

consent to do

Mr. WEEKS. I asked unanimous consent that we should return for that purpose, and I make the point of order it is not in order for the gentleman to offer other amendments to that paragraph.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman asked unanimous consent to return to the paragraph without any statement as to why he

returned to it. Unanimous consent was given for the purpose of returning, but I assume that when unanimous consent was given, it was given for the purpose of considering the paragraph in all its phases, including the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hold that unanimous consent was asked for for the purpose of returning to this specific provision on page 12, and that the committee so gave its consent. Does the gentleman from Illinois ask unanimous consent

to submit an amendment?

Mr. MADDEN. No; I submit an amendment without asking consent, because I assume that in giving unanimous consent to return we did so for the purpose of considering the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair holds otherwise. Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 31539, the Post Office appropriation bill, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amend-ments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any of the amendments? If not, the vote will be taken upon the amendments in gross. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.
The SPEAKER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time,

was read the third time, and passed. On motion of Mr. WEEKS, a motion to reconsider the last vote

was laid on the table.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the Rural Free Delivery Service.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks upon the question of the Rural Free Delivery Service.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, just a moment. Does this

apply to gentlemen who did not obtain recognition?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

EULOGIES ON HON. ALEXANDER STEPHENS CLAY.

Mr. LEE rose

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise? Mr. LEE. To ask unanimous consent to present an order. The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman will pre-

sent for the consideration of the House the following order (No. 19), which the Clerk will read.

There was no objection. The Clerk read as follows:

Ordered. That there be a session of the House at 12 o'clock noon Sunday, February 19, 1911, for the delivery of eulogies on the life, character, and public services of the Hon. ALEXANDER STEPHENS CLAY, late a Senator from the State of Georgia.

The question was taken, and the order was agreed to.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 31856, the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. And, Mr. Speaker, pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that four hours be given to general debate, one half to be controlled by the majority and the other half by the ranking Member of the minority, and in his

absence by the next Member.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that all general debate upon the bill may close in four hours, one-half of which is to be controlled by himself and one-half by the head of the minority of the subcommittee on the District of Columbia of the Committee on Appropriations. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 31856, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, with Mr. Tilson in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 31856, the District of Columbia appropriation bill. Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] Chair hears none.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Kopp].

Mr. KOPP. Mr. Chairman, for a hundred years or more the statesmen of the Old and New World have dreamed of a canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans somewhere in the vicinity of Panama. The navigators of olden days dreaded the trip around the South American coast more than any other journey on the oceans. The history of the negotiations of foreign powers for a foothold at the Isthmus and of the various attempts to construct a canal there is too well known to be reviewed at this Suffice it to say that after the completion of the Suez Canal in 1869 and the great honor paid to its builder, Count Ferdinand De Lesseps, by the whole world, interest was revived. In due time this interest again waned, but in 1898, when the unfortunate trouble with Spain was brewing, it became necessary for that great battleship, the *Oregon*, to make the trip from San Francisco to Hampton Roads, and again interest was revived and with greater fervor. In due time the necessary treaties were made, appropriations secured, and work begun. Since the occupation of this territory by the United States two questions have been paramount in the minds of all Americans: First, what will be the value of this canal commercially? ond, what will be the value of the canal in times of war?

It is not my purpose to discuss the first question now, nor the second, except as it is involved in another question, for connected most intimately with the question of the value of this canal as a military asset is the other question as to whether or not it should be fortified. On the 17th day of May last, and again during this session, the able gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Keifer] made a speech on this floor strongly urging that the canal ought not to be fortified and that its neutrality should be preserved by international agreement. Since that day the newspapers have been discussing the pro and con of the question. Recently the President recommended that an appropriation be made covering the initial cost of fortification. This body will soon be called upon to decide whether or not we shall leave this great highway to be protected by agreement of nations, both in times of peace and in times of war, or shall see to its protection

There are but two features of this question which need dis-First, whether the United States has the right to fortify the canal; and, if so, second, whether we ought to do it. I do not claim to be a great student of international law, but I have examined this question with some care. I think it will not be claimed by anyone that there are more than three foreign countries that have any interest whatsoever in this question— Colombia, Panama, and Great Britain.

The Republic of Colombia was established in 1819, but in 1831

this was divided into three parts, each with an independent government, and afterwards known as New Granada, Venezuela, and Ecuador. In 1862 New Granada was changed to the United States of Colombia, and since 1886 has been known as the Republic of Colombia. The only treaty with Colombia or its predecessors which is concerned in the discussion of this subject is the treaty of 1846, concluded on the part of the United States by Mr. B. A. Bilback and on the part of New Granada or Colombia by M. M. Mallarino. The only part of the treaty which is concerned in our discussion is a part of Article XXXV, as

And in order to secure to themselves the tranquil and constant enjoyment of these advantages, and as an especial compensation for the said advantages, and for the favors they have acquired by the fourth, fifth, and sixth articles of this treaty, the United States guarantee positively and efficaciously to New Granada, by the present stipulation, the perfect neutrality of the before-mentioned Isthmus, with the view that the free transit from the one to the other sea may not be interrupted or embarrassed in any future time while this treaty exists; and in consequence the United States also guarantee, in the same manner, the rights of sovereignty and property which New Granada has and possesses over the said territory.

I think it will be admitted that no other treaty with Colombia affects the situation at all, and if the Republic of Colombia has any rights in the Canal Zone it is by virtue of this treaty. It is a fundamental principle in international law that-

Treaties relating to boundaries, to water courses, and to ways of communication constitute obligations which are connected with the

territory and follow it through the mutations of national ownership. (Moore's International Law, Vol. III, p. 104; Principes du Droit des Gens, Vol. I, pp. 72-73.)

When the Republic of Panama was recognized by the nations of the world and became free and independent, it followed that it assumed all the responsibilities and enjoyed all the privileges imposed and conferred by the treaty of 1846, so far as they related to the territory through which this canal passes. Colombia then ceased to have any rights over this Canal Zone by virtue of the treaty of 1846. Whatever rights she may have had theretofore became vested in the Republic of Panama and subject to further negotiations by Panama. Thereafter the Republic of Panama entered into a treaty with the United States which is the basis of our rights there.

It was agreed to by the representatives of the United States and Panama on the 18th of November, 1903. After granting to the United States in perpetuity certain rights and privileges in a given territory, it provides in Article XXIII as follows:

If it should become necessary at any time to employ armed forces for the safety or protection of the canal, or of the ships that make use of the same, or the railways and auxiliary works, the United States shall have the right, at all times and in its discretion, to use its police and its land and naval forces or to establish fortifications for those

It is true that this treaty also states in Article XVIII that-The canal, when constructed, and the entrance thereto, shall be neutral in perpetuity, and shall be opened upon the terms provided for by section 1 of Article III of, and in conformity with all the stipulations of, the treaty entered into by the Governments of the United States and Great Britain on November 18, 1901.

But it is a familiar rule of construction that all parts of an instrument must be considered together, with a view of giving life and intent to every word. Adopting this rule and construing the treaty in question, it can not be denied that it was intended that the United States should build this canal and keep it open and neutral in the sense that all nations might be allowed to use it upon the same terms, but with the proviso that the United States should have the right to fortify it, and, of course, the right to fortify it would amount to nothing unless it included the right to exclude the enemy in time of war and to protect it from destruction. To allow the enemy to use it in times of war would be to subject it to such exposure that it might be destroyed without a moment's warning. The only way to effectually protect the canal in times of war would be by preventing the enemy from using it. It would be ridiculous to fortify the canal so as to keep it from being destroyed, and then allow the enemy to steam into it with its war vessels at all. This is the only sensible and reasonable construction that can be placed upon the treaty. What does it mean to fortify a place if it does not include, as ancillary thereto, the right to repel the enemy or keep the enemy from passing through?

I think it can not be effectually claimed that Colombia or

Panama has any rights in the canal country which would prevent the United States fortifying it, or that any treaty obligations with Colombia or Panama will be violated thereby.

The only other nation interested, from a treaty standpoint,

is Great Britain. From an early date Great Britain has been anxious to secure a footbold on, or have a voice in, the management of any canal that might be built through the Isthmus. The Clayton-Bulwer treaty, entered into in 1850, provided that no canal should be built except under the joint supervision of the United States and Great Britain, and by Article VIII stipulated that-

The Governments of the United States and Great Britain having not only desired, in entering into this convention, to accomplish a particular object, but also to establish a general principle, they hereby agree to extend their protection, by treaty stipulations, to any other practicable communications, whether by canal or railway, across the Isthmus which connects North and South America, and especially to the interoceanic communications, should the same prove to be practicable, whether by canal or railway, which are now proposed to be established by the way of Tehuantepec or Panama. In granting, however, their joint protection to any such canals or railways as are by this article specified, it is always understood by the United States and Great Britain that the parties constructing or owning the same shall impose no other charges or conditions of traffic thereupon than the aforesaid Governments shall approve of as just and equitable; and that the same canals or railways, being open to the citizens and subjects of the United States and Great Britain on equal terms, shall also be open on like terms to the citizens and subjects of every other State which is willing to grant thereto such protection as the United States and Great Britain engage to afford. The Governments of the United States and Great Britain having not

It was not long after this treaty was entered into that the United States began to realize the necessity of the building of an Isthmian Canal, if at all, by the United States Govern-ment, or under its direction. After the War with Spain negotiations were opened with a view of entering into a treaty with Great Britain, abrogating the terms of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. The history of these negotiations is familiar. The first draft presented to the Senate, in Article VII, provides No fortification shall be erected commanding the canal or waters adjacent. The United States, however, shall be at liberty to maintain such military police along the canal as may be necessary to protect it against lawlessness and disorder.

This was rejected by the Senate. It is true that the representatives of our Government attempted to have inserted words expressly providing for fortification, but to this Great Britain would not accede. The correspondence between Secretary Hay and Lord Pauncefote is very illuminating.

After repeated negotiations in December, 1901, the Hay-Pauncefote treaty was finally adopted, and this treaty had eliminated the clause prohibiting fortification. Article III, sub-

divisions 1 and 2, are as follows:

The canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations observing these rules, on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any such nation, or its citizens or subjects, in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic, or otherwise. Such conditions and charges of traffic shall be just and

2. The canal shall never be blockaded, nor shall any right of war be exercised nor any act of hostility be committed within it. The United States, however, shall be at liberty to maintain such military police along the canal as may be necessary to protect it against lawlessness and disorder.

It will be noticed that the only agreement as to neutrality is that-

The canal shall be free and open to vessels \* \* \* of all nations \* \* on terms of entire equality, so that there will be no discrimination against any such nation \* \* in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic or otherwise. Such conditions and charges of traffic shall be just and equitable.

By a prior article it is stipulated that the United States Government shall have the exclusive right to provide for the regulation and management of the canal. From this it can clearly be deduced that the United States Government has the right of imposing the conditions and making the regulations under which the vessels of other nations may use the canal; the only limita-tion upon that power is, first, that there shall be no discrimination against any nation, and second, that the conditions and charges shall be just and equitable. This canal will be owned, when completed, by the Government of the United States. It can not be compared in its situation to the Suez Canal. The Suez Canal was constructed by a private corporation, and was owned by no Government. The peoples of all nations were stockholders. From the very nature of things, then, if the corporation was to do business at all, it had to have the assurance of all nations that it would not be destroyed. Supposing that the Universal Company of the Maritime Canal of Suez had built forts to protect the canal, what nation could operate them? corporation can not perform the functions of a Government, and has no right to erect forts with which to fire upon the vessels

The stockholders represented every nation of the world, and from the nature of things could not agree on a matter of this kind, if it had been feasible; and so it will be seen that the only way this company could operate was under agreement of the nations of the world to protect the canal. But when it comes to a construction of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, and considering the fact that the United States, by this treaty, has the right to provide regulations and terms and conditions upon which it shall be open to the nations of the world on equality, that it would not be an unreasonable condition that any nation in order to enjoy the privileges of the canal must be at peace with the United States. Such a condition could certainly not be held "unjust or inequitable," and certainly would apply to all nations of the world equally. Moreover, it is significant that the first draft of the treaty containing words prohibiting fortification of the canal was rejected, and in the treaty finally accepted and agreed upon they were eliminated. The words the United States, however, shall be at liberty to maintain such military police along the canal as may be necessary to protect it against lawlessness and disorder—

must be given some meaning. Does it mean simply that a few companies of soldiers are to be distributed along the canal to keep boys from fishing or to keep individuals from causing trouble or to keep ships and vessels from engaging in conflict on the waters of the lakes, or what? It seems to me that a reasonable interpretation would be that the United States shall use such military force as in its discretion seems best for the protection of the canal against "lawlessness and dis-It can not wait until the "lawlessness and disorder" is present before preparing. If it did, a war vessel might steam into the canal and fire a few shots in Gatun Dam or the locks, and back out, and the United States would be entirely failing to do its duty in protecting the canal from "lawlessness and disorder." To fail to fortify the canal would be like a city failing to have a police force until a riot occurred, and then trying to summon men hastily to preserve order. The riot is pre-

vented or quelled by a well-organized police force being ready and able to do the work for which the department was created.

And just so if the United States is to prevent "lawlessness and disorder" in the canal, which must be construed to mean "lawlessness and disorder" on the part of vessels congregated there or approaching it, it can only be accomplished by having forts erected there, with garrisons and munitions of war necessary for preventing trouble. Any other construction would fall to give to these words any real life or vitality, and make it appear to the nations of the world that the United States entered into a treaty whereby rights were reserved which really meant nothing. I do not think it can be successfully contended that there is any treaty in force with any nation which is a barrier to a complete legal right on the part of the United States Government to keep such military forces and erect such fortifications at the canal as may be necessary to prevent "lawlessness and disorder."

It is for the United States to say what force it considers necessary for that purpose, as it is for the city government to say what police force is necessary to maintain order in the city and prevent "lawlessness and disorder."

Furthermore, one of the rights of sovereignty is to fortify. and so if there is not in a treaty or otherwise a provision prohibiting fortification the right exists as an element of ownership. The clause in the first Hay-Pauncefote treaty prohibiting fortification was stricken out, and in the final treaty adopted, and which is now in force, there was no prohibition. So it seems it can not be successfully claimed that there is any provision preventing the United States fortifying this territory.

Assuming that we have the right to fortify the canal, then the only other question is, Ought we to do it? Much has been said in the discussion of this question about the Suez Canal, and the fact that its neutrality is preserved by international agree-I have heretofore referred to the fact that there is no comparison between the Suez Canal and the Panama because of inherent differences between the modes of construction. The Suez Canal had been the dream of engineers of Europe for some years, but not until Count Ferdinand de Lesseps came upon the field of action was there a serious attempt made to con-

It is interesting to note that during all the time that Count Ferdinand de Lesseps was endeavoring to organize a company and raise money for the construction of this canal Great Britain was vigorously opposing its construction. Every obstacle known to honorable statesmanship was thrown in the way of De Lesseps and his friends, but finally a concession was secured by De Lesseps from the Turkish Government in the year 1854 or 1855. Plans were adopted and preparations made to begin work. Subscriptions were taken for stock in the canal, and citizens of most of the countries of the world subscribed. The company was incorporated under the French law, with a capital stock of 200,000,000 francs—400,000 shares of 500 francs each. The viceroy of Egypt subscribed for 177,000 shares. In 1869 the canal was completed, and even then the British Government had no interest in it until 1875, when it became known that French capitalists contemplated the purchase of a controlling interest in the canal; then the British Government almost immediately dispatched an agent to Egypt, and in November of that year purchased the 177,000 shares owned by the viceroy.

Moreover, England was in a position to consent to a treaty providing for the neutrality of the canal. No nation could make any use of the Suez Canal in a war with Great Britain, for in order to reach any of England's possessions, either way, through the Suez Canal the fleet must pass Alden, Malta, Cyprus, and Gibraltar. These are four of the best protected naval points in the world, and the British statesmen well knew that she commanded the Mediterranean, and by commanding the Mediterranean the territory beyond it, through the fortifications just referred to. And so, from any standpoint, there can be no comparison made between these canals. The Suez Canal was owned by a private corporation and dulit by the money of the stockholders, gathered from the four quarters of the globe. The Panama Canal is being built by the American Government. Moreover, the Suez Canal is a sealevel canal, built through the sand and marshes, and no permanent injury could be done even if a nation should violate the treaty and try to block the canal. To repair any possible damage would mean nothing more than a given amount of

The Panama Canal, on the other hand, is a lock canal, the main part being a great lake many miles in length, supported by monstrous dams. A half dozen well-directed shots from a heavy gun in the locks would mean the loss of millions and putting the canal out of commission for two or three years.

The building of the canal is justified as a Government enterprise, first, because of its great commercial value to our people, and second, as a military asset in case of war. As a commercial asset, in harmony with all the treaties of the world, with few exceptions, it should be free to all nations on the same terms, and will be. As a military asset, in harmony with all the treaties of the world, with few, if any, exceptions, it should belong exclusively to the Government constructing it. In point of logic and morals there is just as much reason for Great Britain to neutralize Gibraltar, or Malta, or Cyprus, or Aden, as for the United States to neutralize the Panama Canal. Would any nation have the temerity to ask Great Britain to join in a treaty for the neutralization of these points? If not, then why should we-there being no treaty requiring itasked to neutralize Panama? The opponents of fortification say that it is not in the interest of peace. I am an advocate of peace, and trust that war will never come again. We are not approaching the solution of the question in the right way, however, when this Nation is asked to build this great canal, one of the primary purposes being military necessity, and then to turn it over to the world, just as great an asset to any other nation as to ours. I wish a convention might be arranged at once of all the nations of the world to consider the question of universal disarmament. When the nations of the world will agree, as I hope and trust they will ere long, that there shall be at least a limited armament, if not universal disarmament, with only an international navy, then we may talk of neutralizing the strategic points of the world.

But so long as the great powers are continuing to build large navies, are continuing to prepare for war, are continuing to prepare to become not only defenders but aggressors in the great world's arena of commerce and war, the United States will fall far short of its duty by failing to prepare itself so as to keep its place among the nations, by peaceful methods if possible; but if not, to preserve it by such force as may be necessary. If those who favor the neutralization by treaty of the Panama Canal would lend their efforts as earnestly to legislation having for its object universal disarmament, they would be proceeding in a more logical manner. As has been stated by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Keifer], we have 32,000 miles of seacoast. A strong argument used for this canal has been that it will enable one fleet in the Atlantic to cooperate with another in the Pacific, and thus increase the efficiency of our Navy, perhaps, 25 per cent. But what will this all amount to if we leave this canal at the mercy of an opponent in times of war? It has been the universal history of treaties of this sort that they have not been kept. In 1882 the British occupied the Suez Canal, although there was an expressed provision in the concession by Turkey that it should remain neutral. Of course, it will be claimed that this was not a treaty binding upon Great Britain, and probably true, but it shows that a nation takes advantage of every opportunity in times of war. The Balkan situation, Berlin treaty, Russo-Japanese War, and Korean problem, all are illustrations of the failure of nations to interfere where neutrality agreements are violated.

Supposing we have such a treaty and, unfortunately, war shall come with any power, be it European or oriental, and there is no protection against the enemy at the canal; our fleet is in the Pacific and the enemy's fleet is in the Gulf of Mexico; a warship steams into the canal and destroys the locks at Pedro Miguel and Miraflores and then proceeds to devastate the Atlantic coast, with our Navy successfully bottled up in the Pacific, except it comes around the Horn, what will our remedy be? Will it be claimed that the other nations will send their battleships to aid ours in the destruction of the enemy? No: it can not be, for it is the universal history of the world that nations are loath to send their armies or navies into conflict where the nation sending them has no direct interest. What about the violation of the treaty concerning Korea? Did we send battleships? What about the violation of the treaty concerning the principalities of southern Europe, the Berlin treaty? Did the nations of the world send their battleships? Most emphatically, no. Then, what will our remedy be in case of violation? Nothing but indemnity-damages, if you please. Now, I think every patriotic American will admit, if the time ever comes when we are again engaged in a great conflict upon land or by sea, that indemnity is not what will be looked for, but rather victory and the cessation of hostilities. We might secure victory without the canal, but at great cost and after a prolonged struggle, whereas with it as our own asset the struggle might be of short duration.

Apropos of this discussion, a letter from that great statesman, James G. Blaine, to Minister Lowell in 1881 on this subject is interesting and shows how he viewed this great question. It is as follows:

If this canal is to be built and operated by our Government, it would seem that we are derelict in our duty if we fail to take every precaution necessary to preserve it to the nations of the world. It is interesting to know that when the Hay-Pauncefote treaty was being negotiated in 1900 Lord Lansdowne, in a memorandum accompanying a dispatch concerning the final treaty, said:

the final treaty, said:

In my dispatch I pointed out the dangerous ambiguity of an instrument of which one clause permitted the adoption of defensive measures, while another prohibited the erection of fortifications. It is most important that no doubt should exist as to the intention of the contracting parties. As to this I understand that by the omission of all reference to the matter of defense the United States Government desire to reserve the power of taking measures to protect the canal, at any time when the United States may be at war, from destruction or damage at the hands of an enemy or enemies. On the other hand, I conclude that, with the above exception, there is no intention to derogate from the principles of neutrality laid down by the rules. As to the first of these propositions, I am not prepared to deny that contingencies may arise when not only from a national point of view, but on behalf of the commercial interests of the whole world, it might be of supreme importance to the United States that they should be free to adopt mensures for the defense of the canal at a moment when they were themselves engaged in hostilities.

Of course this is a part of a communication only, but it

Of course this is a part of a communication only, but it shows that the British statesmen realized how necessary it might be that the canal be protected by some nation, not by treaty but This canal will soon be the greatest interoceanic highway and one of the most strategic points in the world. It is our canal, built by American men with American dollars. If we say anything to the world, let us say this: "Come together in a great international convention; let us agree that navies are useless, that war should cease, that nations shall settle differences by arbitration or judicial decision."

Let us say to them, "When you agree to such a universal

disarmament we are prepared to tear down our hatteries and raze our forts at Panama," and then invite Great Britain to do the same at Gibraltar, and the other nations to do the same throughout the world. This will be taking a step in the right

direction for universal peace. This will be an act which our countrymen will applaud, but while the present state of things countrymen will applaud, but while the present state of things continues to exist, let us not leave this great highway at the mercy of our opponents in times of war. It is claimed by some that no nation will ever dare attack the United States. I hope this may prove true; but to build this great canal and then leave it unprotected would be like building a modern sky-scraper, fireproof, so called, and then fail to install water protection because fire is not likely to occur. The old maxim, "In times of peace prepare for war," is just as true in our national life to-day as ever. Let us have universal peace but let us life to-day as ever. Let us have universal peace, but let us proceed by way of universal disarmament rather than by exposing our national resources to the mercies of the nations of the world.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Olmsted].

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to make a speech, but since the gentleman who has just pre-ceded me [Mr. KOPP] has discussed the subject of fortification of the Panama Canal, it seems an opportune time to present some documents which I think will prove of great interest touching the Panama Canal. The first is a letter written from the Canal Zone, under date of November 8, 1910, by Dr. Henry Sturgis Drinker, who was there on a visit of inspection along with other members of the American Institute of Mining Engineers. Dr. Drinker is well qualified to speak as an expert in such matters. He is not only a skilled engineer but a man of great learning and of wide experience in large affairs before he was called to his present position as president of Lehigh University, that great institution which has sent forth so many practical and successful engineers and prominent men in different avocations of life.

The next matter I desire to present is a series of resolutions adopted by the members of the American Institute of Mining Engineers who visited and inspected the Panama Canal in November, 1910. These resolutions were adopted on the steamer on their way home. These resolutions express the views of experts fresh from an examination of that great work in which this whole country is now so much interested. They are signed by 77 men, very prominent, and covering in their activities nearly every section of the country. Several of them, besides Dr. Drinker, are from my own State, such men, for instance, as Mr. W. A. Lathrop, now president of the Lehigh Coal and Navigation Co., a gentleman of very wide experience in mining as well as in construction and in the management of great enterprises. The list is headed by the president of the American Institute of Mining Engineers. When 77 such men as these agree touching such a matter, their report can not fail to be of very great importance and interest.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks, so as to include these papers in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

PANAMA' CANAL.

[Letter from Dr. Henry Sturgis Drinker, president of Lehigh University, while attending the Canal Zone meeting of the American Institute of Mining Engineers, dated Colon, Canal Zone, Nov. 8, 1910, and addressed to the editors of the Brown and White, the university

COLON, CANAL ZONE, November 8, 1919.

To the EDITORS OF BROWN AND WHITE:

COLON, CANAL ZONE, November 8, 1919.

We reached Colon, on the Atlantic side of the Isthmus, on the morning of November 1, passing on our way in the old seaport of Porto Bello, so mercliessly raided by Morgan and his buccanneers in 1663. Now the locality is peacefully distinguished by the quarry that the Canal Commission has established there for procuring stone for concrete. A great hilliside is being worked down, and the material after being broken down to the proper size, is taken in barges to Colon. (There is another large quarry and crushing plant on the Pacific side.) At Colon we had time to stroll around the town, but there is little to be seen of much interest. Colon—formerly Aspinwall—on the Atlantic side, and Panama, on the Pacific side, were retained by the Republic of Panama—being the two main cities of the Republic—and excepted out of the grant of the Canal Zone to the United States, however, by the treaty of November 18, 1903 (ratified by the United States Senate February 23, 1904), for acquisition of the zone, was given perpetually the power to enforce its sanitary ordinances, and to maintain public order in Colon and Panama in case the Republic of Panama should not be, in the judgment of the United States, able to do so.

The zone is 10 miles wide with an area of about 448 square miles with the canal through the center, about 40½ miles in length from shore to shore—about 50 miles from deep water to deep water. We were taken by special train across to Panama, reaching the Hotel Tivolf, at Ancon, in the afternoon. There is an American Canal Zone settlement at Cristobal, adjoining Colon, and another at Ancon, adjoining Panama. The headquarters of the subsistence department are at Cristobal, and the administration building and main hospital are at Ancon.

The entire canal work and management is in the hands of a commission, appointed by the President, and in all matters subject to his direction and control. The members are: Col. G. W. Goethals, chairman, with Lieut. Cols. H. F. Hodges, D. D. Galliard, and William L. Sibert, and H. H. Rousseau, civil engineer, United States Navy, as assistants and division engineers: Mr. Maurice H. Thatcher, Mr. Joseph Buckiln Bishop, secretary. In going over the work now and in inspecting the layout and condition of the buildings, shops, and plant generally, the first strong impression made on one is a feeling of overwhelming admiration for the masterly and minute care and ability with which the whole project is being developed and managed—quietly, with little talk or fuss, but systematically, scientifically, thoroughly, and energetically. During our week here we have been given every opportunity to view the work. We first, on November 2, ran over in a special train a large portion of the reconstructed Panama Raliroad, of which Mr. J. A. Smith, a former Lehigh Valley Raliroad man in the Wyoming region, and an able manager, is superintendent, and we then visited the great Culebra Cut, the difficulties of which are staggering in their immensity. This cut is some 9 miles long—bottom width of channel 300 feet; highest point of excavation on center line 312 feet—at Contractors Hill, 410 feet, and at Gold Hill, 534 feet, and its greatest width about 1,900 feet, but this width is subject to slides and changes until the sides take on their final angle of rest. From May 4, 1904, to April 1, 1910, some 45,624,605 cubic yards of earth and rock were removed, leaving 32,417,690 cubic yards as the estimated amount still to be removed. The systematic, orderly, expeditious transportation department that calls out the enthusiastic praise of experienced railroad men. Steam shovels are, of course, everywhere used for both earth and shattered rock, and in the rock work the machine rock drills of our friends, the Ingersoil-Rand Co., are doing great

November 4 we visited the locks at Pedro Miguel and Miraflores. November 5 inspected the Pacific entrance and the islands in Panama Bay, and visited and lunched at the sanitarium for convalescents at Taboga Island. November 6 (Sunday), rested. November 7 visited and inspected Gatun Dam.

So far as a project of such stupendous magnitude as this canal can be taken in in so short a time, we have been over it all. It has to be seen to be appreciated, and next to being actually seen and inspected it should be studied, not only with facts and figures from an engineer-ing standpoint, but with illustrations of the work.

In the first place, bear in mind that no man can study the ground here and go over the plans that have been worked up and hesitate for a moment in the choice between a sea-level and a lock canal. A sea-level canal is simply out of the question. Sentimentally one is inclined to it—most of us have, in ignorance of the real facts, favored the sea-level idea. I know that I did until I came here and had my eyes opened, and it is interesting to note that of the 85 engineers in this party, coming from 18 States and 36 colleges or universities, the unanimous opinion expressed at a meeting held after inspection and study of the canal was in favor of the lock system of construction, and decidedly against the sea-level type. The decision of the Government in favor of a lock canal was finally reached after extended consideration of the two types by a board of 13 consulting engineers—8 Americans and 5 representing European countries—which met in June, 1905. The 5 foreign engineers, with 3 others of this board, favored the sea-level plan; perhaps it was natural that the foreigners should favor the French plan. Five American engineers recommended a lock canal. Finally, after consideration of the reports, the members of the Isthmian Canal Commission recommended to the President the adoption of a lock canal, the summit level to be 85 feet above tide, the type recommended by the American minority report of the board of consulting engineers, for the following reasons:

1. Its first cost will be much less than that of a sea-level canal, nearly \$200,000,000 less.

2. It can be completed much more quickly, fully six years.

3. Its cost of operation and maintenance, including fixed charges, will be less by several million dollars per annum.

4. It provides quicker passage for large ships and large traffic.

6. At equal cost the lock canal would probably be preferable, as insuring safety from floods, stralghter navigation, and less cost of maintenance.

The lock type of 85-foot level was adopted, and construction thereon is now far ad

maintenance.

The lock type of 85-foot level was adopted, and construction thereon is now far advanced. There is no reason to doubt that it will be completed in 1914, and the canal opened to traffic in 1915. As President Roosevelt has pithily summarized the matter, "Hereafter attack on this type, the lock type, is in reality merely attack upon the policy of building any canal at all."

There will be 12 locks, all in duplicate. Three pairs in flight at Gatun (Atlantic side), with combined lift of 85 feet; on the Pacific side, one pair at Pedro Miguel (commonly called Peter McGill), with lift of 30½ feet, and two pairs at Miraflores with combined lift of 54½ feet (at mean tide). The dimensions of all are the same—a usable length of 1,000 feet, and a usable width of 110 feet. Each lock will be a chamber with walls and floor of concrete and water-tight gates at each end. It is estimated that 4,500,000 cubic yards of concrete will be used in the construction of the locks. Forty per cent of the concrete work at Gatun and 20 per cent on the Pacific side has been completed to this date. The cement comes from the Atlas Cement Co., in the Lehigh Valley. \* \* Some 5,000,000 barrels are being supplied under this contract. The gates, for which our alumni, McClintic & Marshall, of Pittsburg, have the contract, will be steel structures 7 feet thick, 65 feet long, and from 47 to 82 feet high, weighing from 400 to 750 tons each. Ninety-two leaves will be required for the entire canal, the total weighing 57,000 tons.

One great possible danger, perhaps the greatest danger to the canal, that from tropical floods, has been obviated by the harnessing of the Chagres River through the construction of the great dam at Gatun, 9,040 feet long over all, measured on the crest, and 1,900 feet wide at

its greatest width from toe to toe. There will be 85 feet pressure of water for 500 feet, and for only about half its length the head of water on the dam will be over 50 feet. The dam is of earth with a core of impermeable material 860 feet wide at bottom. It appears to be well designed, with an enormous factor of safety. The channel of the canal will be located for a number of miles through the lake formed by this dam, and the lake will be an absolutely safe factor in receiving and distributing through its wide area (164 square miles, with a depth in the ship canal varying from 85 to 45 feet and a width in the channel varying from 1,000 to 500 feet) the floods in the Chagres and other tributary rivers. This will be a lake as large as Narragansett Bay, which can safely swallow the rise of even 40 feet in 24 hours that sometimes comes in the Chagres River (a stream ordinarily 300 feet wide and 2 or 3 deep), and this great lake will thus not only safely care for the flood waters, but will store them for canal use in the three months of the dry season, and provide ample depositing place for the silt and gravel carried down by floods.

It is gratifying to realize that this solving of the crucial problem in the canal, by the construction of the great Gatun Dam, was suggested by an American engineer, Mr. Ashbel Welch, in March, 1880, in a discussion of interoceanic projects before the American Society of Civil Engineers.

All the work on the canal is being done directly by the United States

the canal, by the construction of the great Gatun Dam, was suggested by an American engineer, Mr. Ashbel Welch, in March, 1880, in a discussion of interoceanic projects before the American Society of Civil Engineers.

All the work on the canal is being done directly by the United States Government through the Canal Commission, not by contract, and under the conditions presented this is undoubtedly the best plan.

The idea of a canal to join the two oceans is nearly as old as the discovery of the Western Continent. Balboa crossed the Isthmus in 1513 and Saavedra, one of his followers, is said to have first advocated a canal in 1517. The matter was considered by Charles V and by his successor Philip II. Philip, however, was perplexed, as others have been since, by conflicting reports of engineers, so he laid the matter for spiritual advice before the Dominican friars, who, after profoundly pondering the question from an ecclesiastical standpoint, quoted the following verse from the Bible as having direct reference to the Isthmian Canal:

"What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder."

So Philip dropped the idea, and the canal project slumbered for two centuries after his death.

During the last century, beginning with a move by Spain in 1814. various plans for canals, by the Tehuantepec, Nicaragua, Panama, and Darien routes have been discussed, but nothing was practically done until Ferdinand de Lesseps took up the idea in 1878 with his energy and his Gallic fund of sentiment and enthusiasm. The French failed apparently for two reasons:

First. They were defeated by want of knowledge of how to cope with the frightfully insanitary conditions presented.

Second. They undertook an impracticably large task in trying to build a sea-level canal under the unfavorable conditions presented.

Work was finally suspended by them in 1889, when over \$260,000,000 had been spent, and about 66,700,000 cuble yards of excavation had been done, at a cost of nearly \$4 per cubic yard. A new French company took up the work ag

Excavation by the French, useful to the present American project, \$27,000,000.

The Panama Railroad (for which De Lesseps paid \$18,000,000).

Some 76,000 acres of land.

Maps, drawings, and other technical data, valued at \$2,000,000.

Buildings, machinery, etc., valued at \$3,500,000.

The French machinery was of excellent grade as to quality of material and workmanship. It was the best of its kind when purchased. In design, speed, and size of units it is far behind the present standards. As one goes over the work to-day, one sees on all sides discarded pieces of this machinery, bone yards of old material, which Congress refused (from fear of making some exception in the tariff) to allow the commission to ship home free of duty to sell as old from Kindly nature is rapidly covering these sad relics of an unhappy past with a veil of tropical green, and hiding them from the criticism of the careless visitor and from the technical inspection of the modern engineer.

Kindly nature is rapidly covering these sad relics of an unhappy past with a veil of tropical green, and hiding them from the criticism of the careless visitor and from the technical inspection of the modern engineer.

The United States at first attempted to negotiate with the Republic of Colombia for the canal strip, but unsuccessfully. The generally received opinion is that, in addition to the payments proposed to be made to Colombia, individual demands were made for commissions which could not be considered by the United States. The Province of Panama then seceded from Colombia, and a satisfactory treaty was negotiated by which the United States acquired, for \$10,000,000 and an annual payment of \$250,000 to begin nine years after the ratification of the treaty, absolute control over the Canal Zone, with jurisdiction over the adjacent oceans for 3 miles from shore.

The formal transfer of the property of the French Canal Co. to the United States took place May 4, 1904; the first two and one-half years, until January, 1907, were devoted to thorough and essential work of preparation (including sanitary regeneration, building up a proper organization, assembling plant and materials, providing living and eating quarters for nearly 5,000 American employees and over 25,000 laborers, and reconstructing the Panama Railroad), which resulted in advancing and developing the territory, which was practically in the same state as it was in the sixteenth century, to the plane of twentieth-century civilization. When we realize the frightfully insanitary conditions under which the French worked, the wonder is not that with their great resources they falled, but that they had the energy to accomplish so much. Nor were they to blame, for when De Lesseps supended work in 1889, the cause of the transmission of yellow fever and malaria had not been determined. The French did all that the medical science and knowledge of their day taught them to do. They built, at great cost, good large airy hospitals, with open windows, unscreened

were not conclusive, as he used mosquitoes for infection at too short an interval (four or five days) after their biting a patient. Twelve days must elapse before the bite of a mosquito contaminated with yellow fever becomes infecting, and the contamination is only effected during a subsequent period of three or four days during which the mosquito is itself actively affected with the fever.

The fact that the Anopheles carries malaria was established by experiments made in 1898 by Dr. Roland Ross, of the British Indian Army Medical Service, and by three Italian physicians, Drs. Bigami, Bastianelli, and Grassi.

The yellow-fever mosquito theory was tested and demonstrated in Cuba in experiments extending from June, 1900, to February, 1901, by a board of physicians appointed by the Surgeon General of the United States. Of this board Drs, James Carroll and Jesse W. Lazear submitted themselves to be bitten by mosquitoes, infected with yellow fever, as a test. Both had the disease; Dr. Carroll recovered, but Dr. Lazear died, a martyr to a scientific investigation of paramount value to the human race. A beautiful tribute was paid to his memory in a masterly address by Mr. Joseph Bucklin Bishop, secretary of the commission, on May 8, 1910, on the dedication of the memorial windows in St. Luke's Church, at Ancon, in memory of those who lost their lives during the construction of the canal.

Later, under Dr. John Guiteras, of Habana, further tests were made, and among those infected a young American nurse, Miss Clara B. Maas, of Orange, N. J., died. Other experiments showed conclusively that the disease was not contaglous. Several nonimmune Americans voluntarily entered a room made dark, warm, and moist, and containing a quantity of sheets, blankets, pillow silps, and garments, direct from a yellow-fever hospital. They slept for 20 consecutive nights in those contaminated surroundings, and none of them contracted the disease. It has thus been demonstrated that disinfection against yellow fever is valueless, except where

An appointment was made to meet at lunch next day, but the Frenchman did not appear, and on Mr. Mallet's inquiring for him, be found that the Frenchman had died of yellow fever during the night and had been buried at 9 a. m. in the Prince Albert coat, for which Mr. Mallet had paid.

This is only one concrete, well-authenticated instance in an absolutely incredibly frightful condition of affairs. No wonder it resulted in financial and business disorganization and ruin, and our people did wisely and well to go slowly at first by making conditions possible before trying to do work.

The pathetic experience of M. Dingler, one of the leading director generals of the French company, shows the spirit of the French attitude to the work. Dingler is said to have scoffed at the stories of the fatal effects of sickness on the Isthmus—"I Intend to show them that fatal effects of sickness on the Isthmus—"I Intend to show them that fatal effects of sickness on the Isthmus—"I Intend to show them that fatal effects of sickness on the Isthmus—"I Intend to show them that fatal effects of sickness on the Isthmus—"I Intend to show them that fatal effects of sickness on the Isthmus—"I Intend to show them that fatal effects of sickness on the Isthmus—"I Intend to show them that fatal effects of sickness on the Isthmus—"I Intend to show them that fatal effects of sickness on the Isthmus will sever and die there."

He lost his wife and his three children by yellow fever, went mad, and did from yellow fever: 24 Sisters of Charity came to Ancon Hospital at one time, 20 died of yellow fever. Dr. Gorga estimates that one time, 20 died of yellow fever. Dr. Gorga estimates that one time, 20 died of yellow fever. Dr. Gorga estimates that one time, 20 died of yellow fever. Dr. Gorga estimates that one time, 20 died of yellow fever. Dr. Gorga estimates that one time, 20 died of yellow fever. Dr. Gorga estimates that one time, 20 died of yellow fever. Dr. Gorga estimates that one to experience the great rainfall would seem at fixed a promiser of

care of the comfort, health, and pleasure of the employed, insuring an esprit de corps, a spirit of contentment and zeal, highly conducive to good work, good morals, and good order.

As to earthquakes, the Isthmus appears to be outside the zone of disturbance. Masonry structures of unsubstantial construction have been standing in Panama for upward of 200 years. No danger from this source need, apparently, to be apprehended.

Work is proceeding under the revised estimate of 1908, in round numbers, as follows:

Engineering work (total)
Sanitation, \$20.053,000; civil administration, \$7,382,000
French Co., \$40,000,000, and Republic of Panama, \$10,000,000 \$297, 766, 000 27, 435, 000

Total estimated cost of completed canal\_\_

Three million three hundred thousand dollars has been expended in the cities of Colon and Panama for pavements, waterworks, sewers, etc. This sum will be returned to the United States Treasury by water rates collected by the United States during the next 50 years.

#### CANAL STATISTICS.

CANAL STATISTICS.

Length from deep water to deep water, 50½ miles.
Length on land, 40½ miles.
Bottom width of channel, maximum (Gatun Lake), 1,000 feet.
Balance of distance through Gatun Lake, 800 to 500 feet.
Bottom width of channel, minimum, 9 miles, Culebra Cut, 300 feet.
Average bottom width throughout canal, 649 feet.
Locks, in pair, 12.
Locks, usable length, 1,000 feet.
Locks, usable width, 110 feet.
Gatun Lake, area, 164 square miles.
Gatun Lake, channel depth, 85 to 45 feet.
Minimum depth of canal throughout, 41 feet.
Excavation, estimated total, 174,666,594 cubic yards.
Excavation, amount accomplished by November 1, 1910, 120,000,000 cubic yards; being two-thirds of all to be excavated and leaving 60,000,000 cubic yards yet to be removed.
Excavation by the French, 78,146,960 cubic yards.
Excavation by French, useful to present canal, 29,908,000 cubic yards.

Excavation by French, useful to present characteristics, yards.
Excavation in 1907 (beginning of American work on large scale), 15,765,290 cubic yards.
Excavation, 1908, 37,000,000 cubic yards.
Excavation, 1909, 35,000,000 cubic yards,
Excavation, two years, 1908-9, 72,000,000 cubic yards; or, a monthly average of 3,000,000 cubic yards, nearly one-half of entire excavation for canal; 2,500,000 cubic yards can readily be excavated

monthly average of 3,000,000 cubic yards can readily be excavation for canal; 2,500,000 cubic yards can readily be excavation for canal; 2,500,000 cubic yards.

Concrete, total estimated for canal, 5,000,000 cubic yards.

Time of transit through completed canal, 10 to 12 hours.

Time of passage through locks, three hours.

Relocated Panama Railroad, estimated cost, \$7,225,000.

Relocated Panama Railroad, length, 46.2 miles.

Canal Zone, area, about 448 square miles.

Canal Zone area owned by United States, about 322 square miles.

French buildings, number acquired, 2,150.

French buildings, number used, 1,537.

French buildings, net value when acquired, \$1,959,203.

Value of utilized French equipment, \$1,000,000.

Canal force, actually at work, about 39,000.

Canal force, Americans, about 5,500.

Cost of canal, estimated total, \$375,000,000.

Work begun by Americans, May 4, 1904.

Date of completion, January 1, 1915.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF MINING ENGINEERS WHO VISITED AND INSPECTED THE PANAMA CANAL

STEAMSHIP PRINZ AUGUST WILHELM, At Sea, November 14, 1910.

We, the undersigned, members and guests of the American Institute of Mining Engineers, after a visit to the Isthmus of Panama, and inspection of the work of the United States Isthmian Canal Commission, and after full discussion of our individual impressions, find ourselves in unanimous agreement as to the following conclusions:

1. The present plan of the work is clearly practicable, and the best, in our judgment, that could be devised under the conditions imposed. It is perhaps a question whether by the choice of a higher level some of the difficulties and uncertainties of excavation in the Culebra Cut mighn not have been minimized; but a higher level has its disadvantages also, and no one now seriously proposes such a plan. On the other hand, we are convinced that a canal at a lower level, and especially at sea level, is practically out of the question; that no man can estimate its cost, or even guarantee its satisfactory completion and maintenance at any cost. We are satisfied that the sea-level canal, as

proposed, if actually completed, would be inferior to the present lock chall by reason of its necessarily narrow and tortuous channel, its lively free, etc. The experience gained in the Culchra Cut throws additional light upon the sea-level plan, and renders that scheme less than the control of the contro

Alan Wood Iron & Steel Co., Conshohocken, Pa.; Thomas D. Wood, iron manufacturer, Alan Wood Iron & Steel Co., Bryn Mawr, Pa.; John W. Alles, general manager and treasurer Crescent Coal Co., Pittsburg, Pa.; William I. Berryman, attorney at law and trust officer, Union Trust Co., Pittsburg, Pa.; Alexander L. Brodhead, mining engineer, Crane Iron Works, Catasauqua, Pa.; W. J. Davidson, president Staten Island Shipbuilding Co., Port Richmond, N. X.; D. C. Dodge, Denver, Colo.; John W. Donnau, attorney at law, Washington, D. C.; Philip Goodwill, formerly president the Pocahontas Co., Bramwell, W. Va.; William Ellery Greene, W. Bingham Co., Cleveland, Ohio; C. B. Houck, vice president and general manager W. B. & H. Ry. and L. T. Co., Hazleton, Pa.; Bedford Leighton, insurance, Binghamton, N. Y.; W. F. Mackay, Hayden, Miller & Co., bankers, Cleveland, Ohio; D. G. Miller, manager the Commodore, May Day, and Frank Hough Manufacturing Cos., Denver, Colo.; Frank P. Miller, secretary and treasurer Frank P. Miller Paper Co., East Downington, Pa.; T. T. I. Miller, superintendent of manufacturing, Poughkeepsle, N. Y.; D. G. Moore, president the Port Johnston Towing Co., I Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Thomas W. Orbison, hydraulic engineer, O'Keefe-Orbison Co., Appleton, Wis.; C. M. Russell, president Massillon Iron & Steel Co., Massillon, Ohio; Robert C. Sahlin, South Bethlehem, Pa.; Frederick R. Sayen, secretary Mercer Rubber Co., Hamilton Square, N. J.; F. L. Schoew, president Howard Colliery Co., Bramwell, W. Va.; W. S. Stewart, M. D., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; Charles S. Thomas, Jr., mining engineer, Denver, Colo.; Michael Tracy, merchant, I Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Joseph Underwood, coal operator, Roscoe, Pa.; A. E. Vaughan, broker, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; Brank M. Warren, mining engineer, Jenver, Colo.; Michael Tracy, merchant, I Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Thomas M. Warren, mining engineer, Denver, Colo.; Michael Tracy, merchant, I Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Thomas M. Gordina, Broet, Worcester, Denver, Colo, Michael T

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I now yield one hour to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT].

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the House to the question of retirement or pensions for the civil employees of the Government. I do not think I am assuming much or that I accuse the House either of surprising ignorance or lack of industry in suggesting that I do not believe many Members have given much thought or consideration to the bills that are pending. I know that within the last few days, when it was thought the question might come up, several Members came to me inquiring about the bill which our committee reported. Some of them said they were against the bill, because they did not believe in the Government pensioning clerks at all. Others said some of their Government employees at home thought it was not liberal enough. I thought the fact that it did not satisfy either extreme—those who were against all Government assistance and those who wanted the most possible—was, perhaps, an indication that it was calculated to satisfy those who looked at it impartially and considered the interest of both the Government and its employees. I asked all who spoke to me if they had ever read the bill, and none admitted that he had, and I assume that as a rule the occupations of the Members have prevented their giving the attention to this subject which I think it deserves. I believe this is one of the most important problems which confronts us.

The pay roll of the civil service of the Government is about \$200,000,000 a year, larger than the military or the naval service, and yet there has been no legislation for that service, except in the regular appropriation bills, for about 30 years. In 1883 the method of appointment had produced such demoralization and scandals that under the pressure of public opinion the civil-service law was enacted. That has produced better and more extensive results than its originators could have even hoped, and though by no means ideal has remedied the most flagrant abuses, has won its way into popular favor, includes now 170,000 employees, and no better system has yet been devised. But though the entrance thus provided is satisfactory, though the front door is ample and of good style, yet all the rest of the structure is antiquated and in great need of repair.

The old system of promotion by favoritism and influence has not been prevented; there is great need of a new system of classification, so that there shall be some relation between the class of work done and the amount of salary received, and there should be some method of ridding the service of those whose advancing age prevents their doing full work, but whose infirmities and poverty forbid their peremptory discharge. To remedy this last evil is the object of the bill reported by the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, H. R. 22013, a bill for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service.

There is an agitation all over the country and all over the world about old-age pensions. There is a constant agitation in this House about salaries of employees, of which we had a

vivid illustration this afternoon when the question of Rural Free Delivery Service came up and Members crowded to make themselves popular with the carriers at home. But there is little thought given to a scientific and fair general readjustment, and I think we must admit it is a subject that is most

important and challenges our attention. Our bill is not fundamentally a pension bill, but a compulsory savings bill, and yet in order to put its system in operation it provides pensions for those now in the service. It provides that each employee of the Government shall have deducted from his monthly salary a certain sum, figured out by insurance tables, which, when he becomes 70 years of age, will be sufficient to give him an annuity equal to 1½ per cent of his salary for each year of his service. The way we determined the amount of that percentage was this: We said that if a man has been in the service and devoted his whole life to it, for instance, goes in as a clerk at 20 years of age and stays until he is 70 years of age, he is fairly entitled from that age on to have an annuity of three-quarters of his annual salary. Of course, theoretically the Government ought not to save that for him. Theoretically every man ought to be thrifty enough, and every employer ought to be generous enough, so that a man could each year lay aside sufficient from his annual income to provide for his old age. That is the ideal condition both in private and in Government service. But human nature is so constituted that a very small percentage of us are thrifty or farsighted or selfdenying enough, or are so exempt from the ills and misfortunes of life that we can carry out what we admit is ideal, and let each man put aside and save for his old age. So unless the Government steps in and in some way, either by a pension or by a compulsory savings law, provides an annuity for each man, most of them when they get to 70 years of age will not have any accumulation.

And what is the result of that? We see it in the depart-We see there a great number of men from 70 ments to-day. years up who are not competent to fairly perform their work, and yet are kept there because either their superior officer is not hard-hearted enough to turn them out in the world or because they have some congressional friend who intercedes for them; and so they stay there and clog the department.

I dropped into a Government office this summer, and was asking the official in charge about his employees. He informed me that there was a man there over 80 years old. I asked him if he did competent work, and he told me that he was really of no use to the Government, but that he would not turn him out. He had previously told me that he kept an official record of all the employees, and I asked him if he would let me see his report on that individual. I was rather amused, and I fancy this is illustrative of the whole service, to read his official report of this gentleman, which said that he was faithful and willing, but owing to the infirmities of age his work had to be "largely supervised." I asked him confidentially what he meant by that—it would read very well if you simply saw the record, and you might think he was an efficient employee-and he said. "It means that his work has to be all done over again." Yet that official kept him there because he would not, as most of us would not, turn him out. It was not costing the superior anything to keep him; it was only costing the Government; and so all through the departments there are on duty many old men who are not efficient and who ought to be discharged. Therefore we can face this fact, that if the Government contributes something to rid the departments of the superannuated who are now there it will not be an entire loss; there will be a substantial saving in getting new and efficient men to take their places. We are going to gain something, because in the place of these men who are not competent to do a full day's work, and yet who are mostly drawing high salaries, having been there many years, we will get young men who will probably do twice as much.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will it interrupt the gentleman to make an inquiry at that point?

Mr. GILLETT. It will not.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Upon that very subject, has the gentleman or his committee succeeded in getting any estimate as to how much it is costing the Government annually to carry upon its rolls the names of men not competent by reason of infirmity to do any service or partially disabled from performing their duties?

Mr. GILLETT. No; we have found it impossible to get accurate estimates. The gentleman will recognize the difficulty, because when a department official comes before a committee, if he admits that he has in his employment men who are incapacitated, he admits thereby that he is violating the law, because you know we pass a 'aw every year saying that no department shall keep anybody who is incapacitated. Consequently, even if they knew it, they would conceal the fact.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. And still it is conceded that they know they are doing it?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Now, it occurs to me there ought to be some way of getting that condition expressed in figures, so that from the standpoint of the Government we might be able to know how much we can invest as a Government in this matter of pensions and show, if we are to put employees on a pension, whether we would be expending more than under the present system.

Mr. GILLETT. Let me say in reply to the gentleman's suggestion that we have found no way by which we could compute that. The best estimate I know is by one of the officials, who stated that he thought the men above 70 years here in Washington probably performed on an average three-quarters of their day's work. There is paid in Washington to men over 70 years of age \$1,200,000 in salaries. Now, if they do only three-fourths work, then one-fourth of that \$1,200,000 is wasted. That is \$300,000 a year, and at that rate, inasmuch as there are only one-fourth as many in Washington over 70 as there are in the whole service, there is four times that amount, or \$1,200,000 a year, that is paid for service that is not performed on account of superannuation. Of course this is not accurate.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman permit an interruption for the purpose of information? I would like the gentleman to return to the illustration he gave us about the man who was 80 years old. Did the gentleman investigate to find out how long that man had been in the service?

Mr. GILLETT. I did at the time, but I do not remember

Mr. NORRIS. Do you remember whether it was a long time?

Mr. GILLETT. It was a long time. Mr. NORRIS. Did the gentleman investigate in that particular case, or make any inquiry and find out whether or not that man had, during his service, accumulated any money so that if he were discharged he would be able to live on his accumulation?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes; I was told that he had not accumulated anything.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield to an interruption?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. GOULDEN. Does not the gentleman believe that charge which he has made for inefficient service on account of super-

annuation would have to be borne by the Government in some way or other, or by the respective States and cities?

Mr. GILLETT. I will come to that later. The principle upon which this bill is framed is this: That if the Government could begin now and employ all new officials it would be easy to say that every man who went into the Government service should have deducted from his monthly salary a certain amount which, when he reached the age of 70, should be enough to give him a fair annual income. That would only compel him to do what he ought for his own sake to do without any com-And the salaries should be fixed at a figure which would allow this deduction, and this would entirely do away with the whole question of superannuation in the service—and without any expense to the Government, unless indeed it caused

a general increase of salaries. But everyone must admit that the salary should be of a size that would enable a man to live on it and also lay aside for his old age, so it seems to me that theory as applied to new men entering the service is ideal. But, as the gentleman from New York suggests, the trouble in starting such a savings system is that a portion of the employees are so far advanced in years that you could not expect them to save enough before they reach 70 to live upon for the remainder of their lives. Therefore we were obliged to either make the bill apply only to those who should enter the service in the future or to make some other provision for those who are now so old that they can not reasonably be asked to lay aside enough before they can not reasonably be asked to lay aside enough before they become 70 to support them. And we decided that inasmuch as the Government is to-day practically pensioning many of the old men in the service at an estimated cost of \$1,200,000 per year that it would improve the efficiency and morale of the service, and not cost any more, if we gave everyone over 70 a pension and retired them; and by doing that we could establish for all the future this principle of compulsory savings, so that when those now in the service shall have retired each man shall contribute from his own salary for his own retire-We thought that even if it did involve some additional expense to the Government over the present system, which is improbable, yet it was worth while for the Government to pay establish such a permanent and satisfactory method of settling forever the question of superannuation. Thus

the bill has two parts really quite independent. One provides that all future employees should have deducted from their salaries a fixed amount to support their old age. The other part provides that inasmuch as many of the men now in the service are too old to be able to save enough to support their old age the Government shall assume that burden. I will give later the exact cost and details. The two parts are quite independent. The first could be put in operation and leave present employees as they now are. But we thought it was better to inaugurate the system of deductions from everyone at once, and thus rid the departments at once of the evil of superannuation and establish what we think would be a great and permanent reform.

The bill provides that each person shall contribute monthly a sum sufficient to give him, when he becomes 70, an annuity equal to 1½ per cent of his salary for each year of his service. If he enters at 20 and stays till 70 at a salary of \$1,200 he has served 50 years and should receive 1½ per cent of his salary for each of those years. Fifty times 1½ equals 75 per cent, and 75 per cent of \$1,200 equals \$900, so he would have an annuity of \$900. If he entered the service at 20 he would have target of \$900. If he entered the service at 30, he would have served 40 years at age 70, and 40 times 11 is 60, and 60 per cent of

\$1,200 gives him \$720 per year.

If he did not enter till he was 50 years old, he would only serve 20 years, and 20 times 11 is 30, and 30 per cent of \$1,200 is \$360. So a man entering the service at 50 would only lay by an annuity of \$360 a year, and yet his percentage of deductions would be larger than the younger man, as I will explain later by the tables; so that this system would encourage men to enter the service young and stay permanently, which is advantageous for the service. The bill contemplates that men now over 70 shall be retired at once on an annuity of \$600, to which they have contributed nothing. Everyone else shall begin at once to contribute. The older ones will not be able to contribute enough before they reach 70, and so the Government adds to their contributions enough to give them \$600 a year for life. For example, in the case I just cited, if a man is now 50 and at 70 will have contributed enough to give him an annuity of \$360, the Government would contribute \$240 in addition, so that he would receive \$600 a year. We limited the annuity to which the Government contributes to \$600 because we thought that as it was a gratuity, something to which they were not entitled by their contract of service and only received as a gift, it should only be large enough to give them a support, and so we fixed the arbitrary limit of \$600.

The younger men, who provide their own annuities, have no such limitations, but get the full amount of 1½ per cent of their salaries for each year of service. A Senate bill, introduced by Senator Perkins, gives to these men in the service who get their contributions from the Government the same amounts of 12 per cent of their salaries. That of course largely increases the cost to the Government, and we thought that \$600 per year was sufficient for those who do not contribute it themselves,

but are given it from the Treasury.

Now, I have the figures here to show just how much it would cost the Government to pay these pensions to those now in the service, and so inaugurate the system throughout the whole Government service of 170,000 men and rid the departments permanently of all over 70. It would cost \$1,092,105 the first year; but, as I said a few moments ago, it is computed that we are already losing \$1,200,000 by the inefficiency of these old men, so that really by dismissing them at that cost there would be no additional loss to the Government, but a saving. it would increase little by little for 25 years, when it reaches its maximum, and would cost the Government for that year Then it would decrease, reaching \$1,000,000 in the forty-first year, and very rapidly dwindle away until at the end of 60 years it would be costing the Government hardly

The force would then all be on a self-sustaining basis, and every man when he attained the age of 70 would be getting a pension from his own savings of 11 per cent of his annual salary, multiplied by the number of years he had served. Now, that would cost the Government, in the whole 60 years, \$87,-000,000. That is a large sum, but it is spread over 60 years, and you want to remember that our present system of keeping men at full salaries long after they are unable to fairly earn them is probably costing more than that, so we would be paying no more in pensions than we practically are to-day, and we are establishing for all time a satisfactory system.

Moreover, this is an unusually favorable time to start such a system. The old men in the service are now very few proportionally, because they are the relicts of a time when the service was comparatively small. In the past 20 years the activities of the Government have spread enormously, and the number of employees has immensely increased, both by the

growth of the various departments and by the institution of entirely new classes, such as rural mail carriers. Consequently a large proportion of the service is filled with young men. Thirty and forty years from now, when they become old, the numbers to be retired will be vastly larger than now, but if this bill becomes law they will have earned their own retirement allowances, and the men now old and for whom the Government must provide are comparatively few, so that the expense of pensioning them and inaugurating the system would be less now than it probably ever will be again. Therefore our problem will increase in seriousness now each year, because the number of old men increases annually, and the sooner we begin the cheaper it will be.

Now, let me explain in some detail the bill which we have The first section states the vital principle, and I will reported.

quote it in full:

quote it in full:

That beginning with the 1st day of July next following the passage of this act there shall be deducted and withheld from the monthly salary, pay, or compensation of every officer or employee of the United States to whom this act applies an amount, computed to the nearest tenth of a dollar, that will be sufficient, with interest thereon at 3½ per cent per annum, compounded annually, to purchase from the United States, under the provisions of this act, an annuity, payable quarterly throughout life, for every such employee on arrival at the age of retirement as hereinafter provided, equal to 1½ per cent of his annual salary, pay, or compensation for every full year of service or major fraction thereof between the date of the passage of this act and the arrival of the employee at the age of retirement. The deductions hereby provided for shall be based on such annuity table as the Secretary of the Treasury may direct, and interest at the rate of 3½ per cent per annum, compounded annually, and shall be varied to correspond to any change in the salary of the employee.

You will observe that the amount of annuity which a man is

You will observe that the amount of annuity which a man is to receive after he reaches 70 and retires depends upon the number of years he has served and the amount of his salary. He is to receive 11 per cent of his annual salary for each year of service, or, put more simply, is to receive an income equal to 1½ per cent of all that he has ever received from the Gov-ernment. Thus the longer a man has served and the greater his salary the greater his annuity. It looks like a difficult problem to determine just how much a man must contribute monthly to lay up a sum which will pay him such an annuity, but by the aid of insurance tables it is not difficult. And they show that in order to provide for himself that annuity when he reaches 70 a man with a salary of \$100 per month would have to contribute as follows:

If he entered the service at—	Per month.	Annuity.	
20 years	\$4.30 4.80 5.30 5.90 6.50 7.20 7.90 8.70 9.50	\$900.00 \$10.00 720.00 630.00 540.00 450.00 360.00 270.00	

The older a man is when he enters the service the more he has to contribute and the less is his annuity, owing largely to the factor of interest. The bill provides that all the moneys contributed by employees shall be kept in a separate fund and invested in savings banks or in certain specified bonds, and the Government guarantees 31 per cent interest; and if the investments earn more than that the balance goes to increase their annuities. I personally favored a guaranty of 4 per cent. think the money can probably be made to earn that, and I think the Government can afford to be generous there, and if the rate of earnings were 4 per cent, the monthly deductions from salary would be lower than in the above table. It is interesting to note how large a part interest plays in determining the amount. A man entering the service at 20 on a salary of \$1,200, in order to get an annuity equal to 14 per cent of his annual salary when he becomes 70 must accumulate the sum of \$6,835.50, because that is the amount which the insurance tables show is the value of an annuity of \$900 a year for the rest of his life for a man 70 years old. To provide that sum, he must contribute \$4.30 monthly during his service. But of that \$6,835.50, which his contributions with interest at 3½ per cent amount to, he has really contributed only \$2,560.20, or about one-third, and the balance, \$4,275.30, is interest. We provide that while the re-tiring age is 70, yet if the head of the department certifies in any individual case that the continuance of the employee would be advantageous to the service, he may be retained for a time not exceeding two years, and so on, but that after 1920 no one shall be retained after he is 70. If anyone wishes to leave the service before he is 70, he can withdraw whatever money he has accumulated, with interest, except if he has been there less than six years he only receives the principal and not interest.

So his savings are always his own and he can have them at any time he wishes to leave the service, and when he becomes 70 he can withdraw his earnings and interest in one sum if he prefers to do that rather than take the annuity they will supply. Sections 8 and 9 provide for other deductions to make a disability insurance, but I will not discuss these, for while personally I think the plan a good one, yet I recognize that many will criticize it, and it has nothing in common with the other parts of the bill, and is based on an entirely different prin-Therefore, as it complicates the problem, I shall move to strike it from the bill and leave it to be considered by itself, if it is thought desirable.

The Government is to pay the expense of operating the system, but that would not be large; it has been calculated that 20 clerks could keep the accounts for the whole 170,000 employees. The bill provides that it shall only apply at first to the District of Columbia. This was a compromise with a view of inaugurating it on a small scale, but it is expected that it should be extended to the whole classified service, and the tables and figures of expense are calculated for the whole service.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts

tell us—I know he is thoroughly informed on this subject— how many persons there are in the classified service of the Government:

Mr. GILLETT. There are about 170,000.
Mr. GOULDEN. Does that include the entire classified service?

Mr. GILLETT. That includes the entire classified service. Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Would the legislation that the gentleman is proposing provide immediately, if passed, for all in the civil service now beyond the age of 70 years?

The bill which the committee reported does Mr. GILLETT. not embrace the whole service, though the figures of expense do. We thought we had better start tentatively, and so this bill simply embraces the city of Washington. We thought it would be more likely to pass if it covered simply the District of Columbia, though I should hope it would be extended to the whole service.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. But it would cover all over the age of 70 immediately, if passed, in the city of Washington? Mr. GILLETT. Yes; but the figures of cost that I have given

cover the whole service throughout the country.

Mr. GOULDEN. One more question, if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. GILLETT. I will yield to the gentleman from New

Mr. GOULDEN. What is the number in the classified service in the District of Columbia who would be affected by the proposed bill?

Mr. GILLETT. There are about 25,000. By the way, all the figures I give are about three years old. The committee, or, rather, the Census Bureau, has gone very through a computation of the cost both of this bill and of a There is no guesswork about it. ' A straight pension bill. card was sent to each person in the classified service so that we have a report from each member of the service through the whole country stating his age, the time he has been in the service, his salary, and so forth. Then, each man's probability of living was figured out by insurance tables and the cost to the Government of each individual, so that these figures are not guess figures, but apply accurately to the men now in the service, and consequently give the exact facts.

The gentleman from New York gave us an interesting speech a few days ago advocating a flat pension and that the Government ought to give to each employee after from 25 to 40 years of service a certain annuity. It seems to me that our bill is very much preferable to that for numerous reasons.

In the first place, this bill which we report, if it should once be adopted, after a certain length of time would be absolutely self-supporting. That is one great advantage. This bill also provides that if the person at any time should leave the Government service he could withdraw the full amount of his accumulation. That is an advantage for this reason: One of the great drawbacks of the Government employment as compared with private employment is the difficulty of getting rid of inefficient employees. Private employers, under the stress of competition and economy, inevitably discharge poor employees or cut their wages to the value of the service. That does not happen in the Government service. There is no competition, there is no one to criticize or to know that the reasonable amount of work is not being turned out, for there is no standard of a competitor with which to compare it. So if the inefficient employee appeals to the sympathy of his superior

officer or to his Congressman, he is very apt to be kept despite the fact that for the good of the service he ought to leave.

But if he has a sum to his credit which he can withdraw on retirement, that appeal to sympathy will lose much of its force.

So, the establishment of this system would tend to eradicate one of the great weaknesses of the Government. When we hear the argument that if it is for the advantage of the private corporations to pay pensions, it must be for the advantage of the Government, we do not bear in mind this difference between the two, the private corporation has no difficulty in dismissing incompetent employees; what it aims to do is to bind to it the best employees. The Government, on the contrary, has no difficulty in keeping its employees, but it will be benefited by anything which makes it easier to dismiss the incompetent. The private corporation uses the pension system as a strike insurance, and wants the system which will make its employees most dependent on it and most reluctant to leave and interested in not being dismissed, and that is accomplished by a straight-pension plan. The Government has no fear of strikes; it wants its employees to be self-supporting, and so should favor a compulsory savings

A straight-pension system, on the contrary, greatly increases the difficulty of dismissing an inefficient employee, because he will feel, and his superior officers will feel, that he has by his service practically earned his pension, and in discharging him they not only deprive him of his place, but would also take from him his expectation of a pension. So, while our bill makes it easier to separate an undesirable employee from the service a straight-

pension system would make it much harder.

Then, a straight-pension plan would be very expensive. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN] has introduced several such bills and made a speech in favor of that system last The most moderate and economical of his bills provides that anyone who has served the United States from 20 to 25 years and is 65 years old shall receive an annuity of 40 per cent of his annual pay, and those who have served longer shall receive larger per cents. He does not present any figures to show how much his bill would cost, and in that I think he was shrewd, for I am sure the facts would prevent Congress or the country from approving his bill. The Census Bureau, while calculating the expense of the committee bill, also calculated the expense of a straight-pension bill which would give to employees an annuity equal to 11 per cent of their annual pay for each year of service or, expressed differently, 11 per cent of the total amount they have received from the Government. That would be much less expensive for the Government than any of the Goulden bills. And yet that would cost the Government enormously.

The first year it would cost about the same as the committee bill, but every year after that would cost increasingly more, until in 25 years, when the committee bill reached its maximum expense of \$2,526,216, the straight pension would cost \$8,562, 182. Then, while our bill steadily decreased in cost, that bill would continue increasing, and at the end of 35 years would be costing \$15,000,000 a year; from then on it would increase annually with the increase of the service. In these 35 years it would cost the Government \$159,636,925 more than our bill and when ours had ceased to cost anything this would be still And the Goulden bill would be vastly more exincreasing. pensive than that; how much can only be estimated by long

calculation.

Mr. GOULDEN. Does not the gentleman consider that a straight or flat pension, as he calls it, is much simpler in its administration and much less expensive?

Mr. GILLETT. I do not think it is much less expensive in administration. It is simpler. We calculate that all that it would cost for the present force of the Government to administer this bill would be about 20 clerks, and that is not a very

Mr. GOULDEN. I fear the gentleman will find his estimate

Mr. GILLETT. That is based not on guesswork but on calculation figures

Mr. GOULDEN. And mine is based on 42 years of experience in actuarial work in connection with life insurance.

Mr. GILLETT. What is the gentleman's estimate? Mr. GOULDEN. My estimate is that it will cost you twice that to start with, and, as the number increases, it will go up.

Mr. GILLETT. Oh, certainly; as the classified service increases it would go up, but that is not going to increase, as

assume he does, what percentage of people now in the classified service are carrying regular life insurance or fraternal insurance?

Mr. GILLETT. Of course I do not know.

Mr. GOULDEN. H. Mr. GILLETT. No. Has the gentleman any idea?

Mr. GOULDEN. I should think it would be safe to say 15 to 20 per cent as a low figure.

Mr. GILLETT. How does the gentleman get at that? Mr. GOULDEN. Purely from intercourse with these people, talking with them.

Mr. GILLETT. There are 170,000 of them, and of course neither the gentleman nor I can get at much of a guess through

our personal acquaintances with them.

Mr. GOULDEN. Only last week there was a convention of the national association here in Washington. In talking with gentlemen from all over the country I judged from what they told me that it would be safe to say 25 per cent carry insurance, and therefore this would be an extra burden to bear if the gentleman's bill became a law.

Mr. GILLETT. Well, it is a little singular that of these superannuated men in the service whom we now have to provide for it has not come to our attention that a single one of

them has such insurance.

Mr. DAWSON. If he did he would at least get the double benefit.

Mr. GOULDEN. Perhaps they were too modest to come before the committee. I have not forgotten that order which was executed in 1902 to stop civil-service employees mixing up in affairs of legislation and-

Mr. NORRIS. That would not stop their telling about life insurance

Mr. GOULDEN. But it would stop their making known their wants and desires.

If the gentleman will permit, I want to call Mr. DAWSON. attention right in this particular, and ask the gentleman if it is not true that England has only recently abandoned the straightpension system, in operation for 50 years, and gone to a plan very similar to the one in the gentleman's bill?

Mr. GILLETT. They have modified their old straight pensions in a way that recognizes the principle of this bill. The English system which they had so many years cost 16 to 20 per

Mr. PARSONS. Sixteen to twenty per cent of what? Mr. GILLETT. Of the whole cost of the civil establishment. The pensioned employees cost 16 to 20 per cent annually of the whole civil service.

Mr. DAWSON. Before the gentleman leaves that point raised by the gentleman from New York as to the percentage of cost of this so-called retired list of civil employees in England, it might be of interest to call attention to the fact that our military retired list here may be fairly comparable with what this list would grow to in the end, and in that connection let me call your attention to the fact that the retired list of the Navy embraces 835 retired officers, whereas there are only 2,400 on the active list. In other words, the retired list of officers in the Navy is one-third as large as those on the active list.

Mr. PARSONS. But there could not be anything like as large a proportion in the civil service. They would not retire nearly as early as they are forced to do in the Army and Navy.

age of retirement is 62 years in the Navy.

Mr. GILLETT. Many associations of employees have indorsed the Goulden bill. It is not surprising. They naturally prefer the bill which promises them most. I think they are shortsighted. I think they ought to recognize that no such proposition as that, no such large civil pension list, would be permitted by Congress or the people. Some Congressmen, not having given much study to the subject or having large organizations of employees in their districts, may temporarily favor it. But I do not think any such proposition has any chance of be-And I think the agitation for it by employees and coming law. the attempts to influence Congressmen may bring reaction. of the dangers in the great increase of the Government activities and employees is the existence in our citizenship of a large body of men who have a different interest from the rest of the people in political action. Their income is directly determined They have consequently a political motive by act of Congress. different from the rest of us, and if they allow their political action and their support or opposition to candidates to be determined by his attitude toward their salaries and organize to the gentleman's does, by leaps and bounds, but gradually.

Mr. GOULDEN. There is this to be said in favor of the straight pension, that you levy no assessment whatever on a class of people who can ill afford to stand this assessment; and right there will the gentleman tell us if he knows, and I That would never be undertaken here. But I think it is largely owing to that tendency that there has developed in Congress a growing disposition to modify the civil service and to introduce terms of six or seven years, so that employees shall not, as now, be secure of their positions for life and devote their political energies and organizations to increasing their salaries or lightening their work. A class of citizens who organize with no party ties, except to the candidates who will favor increasing their salaries, will not long retain the approval of the people. There is a broad and legitimate field for such organizations without concentrating upon salaries and pensions.

There have been presented to Congress petitions from between 40,000 and 50,000 employees in favor of our bill and from be tween 50,000 and 60,000 against it. These latter, I understand, oppose it because it is not favorable enough to the employees and because they want a straight-pension bill. Inasmuch as nearly all the opposition to it in Congress, as far as I have been able to ascertain, is because it is too much like a straight pension, I think the employees are shortsighted who oppose it, for I am very sure it is the most favorable to them of any legislation which has any prospect of success. It is opposed in Congress because it pensions the employees too much and opposed by the employees because it does not pension them enough, and this opposition of employees to our bill gives to Congressmen who are opposed to it because it is too much of a pension bill the opportunity to defend their opposition by the fact that those whom it is intended to benefit do not themselves want it.

There is another and very important difference between the operation of a compulsory savings bill and a straight-pension system-greatly to the advantage of the former-in that every man gets exactly what he himself saves, with interest; he conman gets exactly what he himself saves, with interest, he contributes to no one else's increase; and when the system is established there is no temptation or excuse for exceptions or special legislation. The straight-pension system, on the contrary, constantly tempts to exceptions, to favoritism, and to special legislation, and the experience of this House with other pension legislation indicates what this would lead to. experience of other countries proves the same. In the English appropriations you see constantly large amounts for "gratuities," "compassionate allowances," "compensation allowances," and there would inevitably here be constant temptation to enlarge and extend to cases just outside the law, and so forth. That is the most dangerous kind of legislation, the kind our Congress has shown itself least able to cope with fairly, and in itself is a very strong argument against a straight-pension system.

We hear a great deal about the old-age pension laws of Germany and of England, but those, after all, are not any example to us, because they are so ridiculously small in their amount that no American would ever think of them as being a sustaining pension. In England, under their poor laws, the most they ever allow is \$1.25 a week to a man when he reaches the age of 70. That, you see, is about \$60 a year. What would an American employee think of \$60 a year for an old-age pension?

In Germany they have a very elaborate system, where the Government contributes, the employer contributes, and the employee contributes, but their amounts are insignificant compared with ours. It only applies to salaries under \$500. Nobody getting more than \$500 gets anything in Germany, and that would cut off pretty nearly our whole population; but to those who do receive a pension in Germany the Government con-tributes only 50 marks a year—a dollar a month. The employee contributes from 3½ to 9 cents a week, and the annual pension there is only from \$27.50 to \$57.50 a year. So that these foreign analogies which we hear so much about for a flat-pension system are on such a very small scale that they offer no precedent at all for our Government service. And, moreover, the scale of pensions of our American private corporations is so small that it would not be considered a working plan with us. I saw by a report that they averaged last year a little less than \$200 a year for all the employees who are pensioned.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. While the gentleman is on this line of thought I desire to ask him to give expression, if he will, to his views in regard to the effect of legislation at this time in the interest of the 170,000 Government employees, upon millworkers, farm hands, and other breadwinners, who have no Government position, and who become old and worn out in their various employments throughout the country.

Mr. GILLETT. Well, if I catch the gentleman's question, the trouble is that all these persons care very little how we vote on matters affecting Government employees only, and a man may vote against a measure to increase the salary of Government employees and thus save the money of the taxpayers in general, and yet the expense would be so insignificant when distributed that these taxpayers will not care one way

or the other how he voted on that question, while the organization affected will care so deeply that a Member of Congress will feel it. The danger is that this large class which composes the greater part of our population, to whom the gentleman refers, do not care one way or the other how we vote on salaries or pensions for employees.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman spoke of the effect of organization. He referred particularly to the organizations of Government employees. I call his attention to other organizations, such as the American Federation of Labor, the Farmers' Union, and the great conventions of workers apart from the Government service who have been discussing old-age

Mr. GILLETT. I see that I did not before catch the drift of the gentleman's question. I should suppose that they naturally would be encouraged to think that if the Government contributed to the pension of its own employees they would have some right to be considered and that the Government ought to pension them.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will permit, a moment ago the gentleman from Massachusetts referred to the condition prevailing in England and in Germany, and observed that the allowance there was not commensurate with what ought to be allowed here for the maintenance of those who grow old, as, for instance, \$1.25 a week is insufficient to maintain an American man, while it might be sufficient to maintain one in England or in Germany. Has the gentleman taken into account the difference in living conditions there and abroad?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes; that is what I had taken into consideration; and that is the reason I say that it was utterly insignifi-cant to us, although it appears satisfactory to them.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman, of course, is trying to bring to the House a bill that will be satisfactory and that will relieve the Federal Treasury of the great expense of maintaining clerks who have become old or incapacitated, During the discussion of this question it has occurred to me that some day or other the gentleman's committee, or the House, may be obliged to take up the broader question of providing for those who grow old in private service, and who, by reason of the fact that they had no Government place, and no private recourse, might, when needing relief, become charges upon the Government itself.

Mr. GILLETT. I think if the gentleman had heard the explanation of this bill he would have recognized that it avoids that particular tendency, and that that is one of its merits, because this bill does not provide a pension from the Government at all except temporarily, but after those who are now superannuated or becoming so are disposed of, then the system will be absolutely self-sustaining. In other words, it is a compulsory savings bill, and it simply endeavors, because no compulsory savings system could take effect immediately, to make some provision for those who are so old that they can not provide for themselves.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does not the bill go a step further and provide that where a clerk becomes entitled to the benefits resulting from the fund created by his own contributions there shall then be an annuity of a certain amount on the part of the Government?

Mr. GILLETT. Oh, no. It does for those who are now in the service, but not after the system is established. The bill could take effect to-day for those who are going to enter the service, for the young men, and it would not cost the Government anything; but, in order to have it take effect immediately for all, and to get rid of the present superannuation in the service, it does provide that for the men now old or becoming old the Government shall contribute up to \$600 in addition to what they contribute themselves.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then the bill does contemplate an actual contribution by the Government?

Mr. GILLETT. It does, but only temporarily.
Mr. PEARRE. Will the gentleman state to the House the amount of appropriation which will be required from the Treasury of the United States to meet the immediate retirements?

Mr. GILLETT. I stated all that earlier when the gentleman must have been engaged.

Mr. PEARRE. I did not catch it.

Mr. GILLETT. I have stated it all, and it will be in the RECORD. Now, I recognize, Mr. Chairman, that from the present salaries of the employees it will be difficult for some of them to make this contribution. I recognize that out of a salary of \$600, for instance, it is pretty hard for the clerks to make any contribution. I think myself that one of the vital needs of the service to-day, as vital as this, is a reclassification of the entire clerical service, with a readjustment of salaries, and our committee

reported contemporaneously with this bill a bill providing for such a reclassification, so that compensation shall have some relation to the work that is done. That, it seems to me, is one of the most important reforms that our civil service needs. Clerks to-day are working side by side and doing the same kind and amount of work, and one is receiving \$1,000 and the other \$1,800. Clerks at \$1,200 are sometimes doing much more difficult work than others at \$1,800. That our reclassification bill undertakes to remedy. Another reform that we need is to regulate the promotions in the service. We passed our civil-service law in 1883, and by good luck we got a fairly good method of entering the service; not ideal, but the best that has yet been brought forward; but we have in some departments no method of regulating the promotions after they get into the service, and those promotions are too often made by favoritism. I think that ought to be corrected; but most, I think, this re-classification ought to be adopted. I believe that in the Government service we pay our employees too little at the bottom and too little at the top, and that probably along in between some are overpaid. I think those who go in at \$600 are not getting enough to procure the kind of clerk you want in the Government employ, for it is more exacting in some ways than private employment; the work must be done better, more accurately, and carefully.

I think, on the other hand, that the heads of bureaus and the heads of divisions are not getting enough for the executive capacity we need. There is where economy is accomplished, and yet we pay such small amounts to the heads of bureaus and divisions that we do not get the men with that energy and efficiency, with that desire to produce reforms, that we have in any large business. In the conduct of a large business it is capacity, brains, and energy of men at the top that makes

the business succeed or fail.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.
Mr. NORRIS. I want to suggest to the gentleman that in paying higher salaries to the heads of bureaus, and in connec-tion with the remark that it is there where we want energy and capacity to reduce expenses, that the conditions which the gentleman himself illustrated here—by speaking of a clerk who was 80 years old and who was not reported as incapacitated by the head of the bureau—would not be relieved if he increased the salary of the bureau head whose duty it was, technically, to discharge the clerk, but did not do it, and reported, in fact,

Mr. NORRIS. Is not that one of the great reasons why the service is expensive, regardless of what we may think of the duty to discharge?

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman means that they have incompetent subordinates?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.
Mr. GILLETT. Yes; that contributes, but I think that the great reason is, there is no motive for the head of the bureau or of the division to accomplish a great work with his force, to keep them up to the mark, and there is no standard as there is in private business by which you can tell whether or not they are doing as much as they ought to.

Mr. NORRIS. I am satisfied that that is true, and is not this true also: That these men and women who, by reason of age, have become incompetent are the ones who are getting the

highest salaries in the service?

Mr. GILLETT. A great many are. Our figures show that the men over 70 years of age get a little more than the average of the class in which they are.

Now, to summarize the arguments for this bill:

First. It establishes a system by which at the end of 50 years every employee will be contributing enough to give himself a reasonable pension from the age of 70 until his death without any contribution from the Government.

Second. During that 50 years while the system is establishing itself the Government will have to supplement the individual contributions, but that will probably not cost the Government as much as the present practice of keeping men after their efficiency is impaired by age, and will not cost more than one-half of 1 per cent of the annual salary roll of the civil establishment

Third. It has these advantages over the alternative of a

straight pension:

(a) It costs the Government \$159,000,000 less in the first 35 years, and after 50 years costs the Government practically nothing, while the other system keeps increasing the annual cost forever.

(b) By making each individual self-supporting it takes away all excuse for special pension legislation, while experience shows that the other system is a constant temptation and encouragement to such legislation and extension.

(c) It makes it easier to discharge inefficient employees, which is now difficult, while the straight-pension system greatly in-

creases that difficulty.

It would be unfair not to allude to the great assistance the committee has had from Mr. Herbert D. Brown, who first brought the principle on which this bill is based to our attention, who formulated the first bill, who has superintended the many laborious calculations incident to it, and to whose ingenuity and industry its merits are mainly due. [Applause.]

Mr. BOWERS. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 30 minutes to the

gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Borland].

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I should like to submit some views in regard to the District of Columbia appropriation bill now before the committee. This bill is one of those prepared annually by a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, a body of gentlemen in whom the House has individual and collective confidence. That subcommittee is presided over by the distinguished gentleman, a Member of the other side of the House, who is closing for this time his service here—a man whose keen intellect and whose rigid integrity have been most valuable assets, no doubt, to the people of this District as well as to the people of the Nation. So that what I may say as to my own individual views regarding possible changes in the method of governing the District can have no relation to the personnel of the present subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. But I am firmly convinced, Mr. Chairman, after a brief service on the District Committee of this House, that a change would be desirable.

We have seen the District Committee struggling here during the last session of Congress and during the present session to get before the House matters of necessary legislation, and in each case, or in almost each case, they were defeated. present session of the House there has been, I think, but two District days, and the time was greatly taken up on those days by other matters.

Here is a great community, practically a little State, having a wealth and population equal to some States, wholly under the constitutional jurisdiction of Congress, and it is our duty to provide some adequate method of government satisfactory not only to the people of the District, but satisfactory to ourselves

and to the people of the country.

This particular appropriation bill now brought in contains a large number of items of legislation. Some five or six pages of the report are made up of statements of new legislation embodied in the appropriation bill. I am not prepared to say, and do not say, that this legislation is not wise or is not imperatively necessary. Some of it that I have had an opportunity to study I believe to be necessary; but there should be some other way of presenting general legislation to the lawmaking body than in the items of an appropriation bill.

If this legislation is necessary, it should have been brought in here by the District Committee. The power of governing the District is divided now among three committees of the House, absolutely without any correlation. The great power of the purse is lodged in the subcommittee of the Appropriation Committee, the only power worth speaking of in legislation, the

power of conducting the expenditure.

That great subcommittee, having that power of the purse necessarily has forced upon its attention matters of general legislation for the good of the District, for where else will men look for the power over their lives and property but in the body that has the control of the public purse?

Then there is a second body supposed to govern the District, namely, the Committee on the District of Columbia, which has the high prerogative of passing upon street-opening cases. Day after day and week after week it spends its time deciding as to what streets shall be opened and what shall be closed and how wide a particular street shall be. That committee has performed patiently as it could, ably as it could, the thankless task of going through one street-opening case after another, only in the end to find that their labors were useless unless another committee somewhere chose to provide the necessary funds. Then a part of the power is lodged in the Judiciary Committee in its control over the court.

This bill carries with it an appropriation of eleven million two hundred and fifty-six thousand and odd dollars. A small fraction of the appropriations carried are said to be fixed charges against the District itself, and the rest of the appropriations are, under a plan of government which relates back a number of years, divided equally between the Federal Treasury and the District treasury. The amount, as stated by this report, which is required to be paid out of the Treasury of the General Government is \$5,638,418.25. I am not prepared to say that the expense of governing the District is excessive, although I have an idea that possibly that might be true, but \$11,000,000 for governing a city of this kind is a great deal of money. That five million six hundred thousand and odd dollars should be paid out of the General Treasury of the United States is a very serious matter, and if we consider the fact that the annual appropriations are increasing and that they increase relatively exactly in accordance with the taxing power of the District, the time is not far distant when we will be spending ten, twelve, or fifteen, or possibly twenty millions of dollars a year out of the Federal Treasury toward the maintenance of the

The plan practically in operation is that every dollar of the taxing power of the District is used—its personal tax, its realestate tax, its excise tax, all-and that lump sum is doubled on the assumption that the Federal Government must pay half of the appropriations for the District, and then the estimates for the year are brought within that doubled sum. While it is possible, as was pointed out a few weeks ago on the floor of this House, for Congress to say that only a less amount shall be paid by the Federal Government, it does not as a matter of fact do so. So that practically the condition we face is this, that every time a dollar's worth of property increases in taxable value in the District, every time we pass a law requiring the raising of the license fee or increasing any form of tax, we are placing an equal burden dollar for dollar upon the Federal Treasury.

The other day we considered from the District Committee a bill to raise an inheritance tax. Nobody knew how much taxes would be raised by it. Everybody conceded it was a just form of taxation, and that large estates in the District here should be made to contribute toward the expense of the District, but nobody seemed to have considered that the taxes raised on those estates would be doubled by an equal amount raised from the Federal Treasury; that no correlation existed between the District Committee that reported that bill and the Appropriations Committee that apportions and expends the

money raised from the District. This District is said to owe the United States \$10,000,000 in bonded debts and something between three and four millions of dollars in floating debts. The Commissioner of the District reported that inasmuch as that floating debt is being liquidated out of the common contributions, or what he calls the partnership contributions, it really amounts to a floating debt of nearly \$8,000,000, because he figures that every time you cut off a part of that floating debt you cut down the power to tax the Federal Treasury an equal amount. If the District pays off \$100,000 of its floating indebtedness, it loses \$100,000 that it might drag out of the Federal Treasury under the joint system of appropriations. Therefore, he says, they are losing \$8,000,000 by paying \$4,000,000. A most extraordinary system of public accounting seems to have been the outcome of that. But assuming that the debt is \$14,000,000, there is now pending before the District Committee a bill, known as the Judson bill, to wipe out that \$14,000,000, and provide a fund for general improvements of the District. This bill, among its other good features, not only provides for a system of public improvements—which probably is badly needed by the District, and I believe is—but makes a sane provision for the first time for the extinguishment of this debt, which has been in existence nearly 30 years.

But it is intended to extinguish it, how? By taking out of the joint contribution of the Federal Treasury and the District revenue enough each year to provide a sinking fund and to wipe it out. In other words, we are going to pay back Uncle Sam with Uncle Sam's own dollars or else we are not going to pay him back at all. Now, that kind of a way of paying back a debt is a better kind of a proposition than none. It is certainly an improvement over the present plan of not paying the debt, but it is not just, I think, to put a tax upon the District when it is led to expect that its debts will be paid to the United States by the United States. Pretty nearly every improvement in the District is paid for out of the general fund of the District. I believe that there are only a very few--sidewalks and paving of alleys and curbs and lateral sewers; that means alley sewers that are paid for by the abutting property benefited. one of the great sources of complaint in the District-that general improvements, street openings, and improvements of all kinds are paid for out of the general fund. Under that system it is perfectly possible to devote the revenue of the District toward one part of the District so as to provide for a pavement in the interest of a certain set of people regardless of the interest of other sets of people.

What the District Committee has often considered, without

the power to bring it into realization, is the power of placing

upon the property owner benefited the expense of the improvement. It is his property which is benefited, and not a dollar of the expense should be taken out of the Federal Treasury. If a special improvement goes into a new addition in the District and the real estate in that new addition be increased in valuewhich is a thing that goes on in the improvement of almost every growing city—that new addition should pay the entire cost of that special improvement, and not a dollar of it should be paid out of the District funds. Certainly not a dollar should be paid out of the funds of the people of the United States. Nothing can be more dangerous from a taxation standpoint or a real-estate speculation standpoint nor from any other standpoint than the idea that some set of men can draw upon the public fund to benefit a particular section where they are interested financially in the growth of the property.

A change could be made and should be made by which these sources of expenditure should wholly be removed from the District appropriation bill and a system of special assessments adopted, such as exists in my own city and almost every other growing city, by which the property owner in the benefited district himself pays for all the improvements. When that is done the District Committee will have taken off its shoulders 50 per cent of the now useless labor which it performs. soon as the property owners in the District get ready to pay for an improvement they should be allowed to do the work and pay for it without anybody else's say so. If they want a street opened and are willing to pay for it, they should have it opened, and if they want a street opened and are willing to pay for it, they should have it approved by executive action without a bill before this House or the Senate. If they want that thing done, I am willing for them to pave every street in the District just as fast as they want to pave them. There is no reason on earth why the time of Congress and the time of its committees should be taken up by matters of that kind.

My distinguished friend from Minnesota brought forward in the District Committee, and I do not betray any confidence because it has been brought on the floor, a proposition by which it is proposed to levy a tax upon the intangible personal property in the District. It developed in our hearing, as a matter of surprise, that there was a tax on real estate and on the tangible personal property; that every clerk and laboring man in this District pays upon his household furniture, but not a dollar's worth on stocks and bonds are paid for by anybody anywhere in the District. A bill was brought forward to correct that. But does anybody know how much tax that will produce, and does anybody believe it would be just to do that if it also involves further expense to the Federal Treasury? Where is the necessity of doing that which puts a great burden upon the Federal Treasury

Does anybody know when that bill will ever Mr. NYE. be reached?

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman asks, "Does anybody know when that bill will ever be reached?" I say if the District Committee has the same consideration from now on that it has had before neither the gentleman nor I will live long enough to see it. We will never live long enough to reach the loan-shark bill that the District Committee has struggled with for weeks. There is plenty of legislation before the District Committee that there is absolutely no chance of reaching.

Now, then, if it pleases the Chairman, I served a short time on the District Committee. I do not know that I shall serve in the next Congress on that committee, and probably not. But I believe the people of the District of Columbia are entitled to a committee with ample powers, which shall be the legislature of this great Commonwealth. That District Comlegislature of this great Commonwealth. mittee should have the power to appropriate the taxes of the District of Columbia without the concurrence of any other committee. It should have the powers now vested in the Judiciary Committee, and it should be able through its hearings to so keep in touch with the citizenship of the District that the wants and needs of the District, which are struggling toward autonomy, struggling toward the measure of self-government that it is entitled to, should have a forum where its cause can be heard, and when its cause is heard by that forum, that committee should have the power to mold into laws and bring to the attention of Congress those measures necessary for the government of the District. Until that is done, we shall have appropriation bills loaded with e We shall have the District incidental of general legislation. Committee put aside, because they do not make up their own appropriation bills, and nobody cares anything about them, and we shall have the District business in the same haphazard fashion it has been in heretofore.

I hope to see the District Committee clothed with power to expend the revenues of the District. I hope that it will have the

power to apportion those revenues for the benefit of the people of the District, and yet will not be put under the necessity, as we now seem to be under, of contributing out of the Treasury of "Uncle Sam" dollar for dollar for every dollar assessed. There may be some reason why the United States should double the amount raised by real-estate taxation of the District, about \$4,200,000; but there is no reason why it should double the amount raised from police-court fines of the District, or the saloon licenses of the District, or the inheritance tax of the District, or the taxation upon stocks and bonds-absolutely none. And until that change is made and the people of this District are given power to improve their own property at their own will and a District Committee empowered to expend their funds according to the views of the people of the District, the same difficulty will be encountered.

How much time have I remaining, Mr. Chairman? The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has eight minutes remain-

ing.

Mr. NYE. Will the gentleman permit a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NYE]? Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. NYE. I wanted to ask if the gentleman has made any comparison between this and other cities as to the cost of administration, which is something like \$11,000,000 that we are

Mr. BORLAND. The cost of administering my city, which is a little smaller than the gentleman's city, but which we place almost in the same class, is about one-third the cost of administering the District of Columbia. The figures are a little bit misleading from this fact. I presume it is true in the gentle-man's city, as in mine, that the school district is a separate organization, and that special assessments levied upon private property for special benefits are not included in the general When we take out those two items, it is probable the expense of administering the District is about twice the expense of administering Minneapolis or Kansas City. I think that indicates the expense of administering the District is too great. I think that is due to the fact of the division of authority into two committees, and that neither committee has the full power of administering the funds of the District.

And why should the Appropriations Committee, with all respect to it, expend the funds of the District? The Appropriations Committee expends the funds of the United States. But 50 per cent or more of the funds of the District are contributed by the District. Why would it not be better for the Nation to by the District. Why would it not be better for the Nation to submit to a charge equaling, say, the taxes realized from the real estate of the District, put that to the credit of the District, and allow the whole sum, including all that the District cares to raise, to be administered by a District committee, accountable and open to the citizens of the District? Why should the Appropriations Committee undertake or desire to administer funds

which belong wholly to the District?

I believe that if the bill of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NyE] ever does get before this House and passes, as it undoubtedly will, a very large amount will be added to the current revenues of the District. Before that time comes, or when that time comes, an adjustment should be made between the relations of the Federal Government and the District, fair to the Government and fair to the District, which will enable the District to increase its taxation and its improvements as fast as the people of the District want to increase them, without feeling that they are bound by the opinion or wishes in matters of purely personal and local consideration to the views of the House of Representatives or to the people of the Nation.

But as long as we are held fast and bound to the dollar-fordollar rule, there is going to be the same fight in this House with every street-opening case that has occurred since I have been a Member of the House. We are going to take up the time of the House, we are going to wear out the patience of Members, we are going to excite their suspicions here and their suspicions there as to nearly every street-opening case, for fear some fellow is working some kind of a real-estate game back I believe if the District Committee of the United States Congress be clothed with full power to administer the affairs of the District, it ought to place in the hands of the property owners of the District all of the measure of control in the matter of local improvements that is contained in the charters of the great cities of this country.

I believe the committee ought to place in the power of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia all of the powers that can be safely administered by the administrative or executive officers of any of the great municipalities of this country, and it should reserve in the District Committee itself only the legislative powers that properly belong in a legislative body.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I think I am not mistaken about it-I understood the gentleman's argument to be that there should be a change in the assessment of taxes on account of street openings. It has been my understanding for years that we have been assessing the benefit on the abutting property when streets were opened. Is not that the understanding of the

gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes. I understand that the amount is advanced by the General Government and is paid back on an assessment on the property.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Not by the General Government, but out of the light recovery of the General Government and the Discourse of the Construction of of

of the joint revenues of the General Government and the District.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. But advanced by the General Government.

Mr. BORLAND. Advanced out of the joint revenues and paid

by the property owner.

When the amounts are paid back they shall be carried not into the Federal Treasury but into the nearest like appropriation. And the nearest like appropriation has been growing on that account. Now, this bill changes that, I am glad to say. is one of the pieces of legislation they have put in this bill that they ought to put in it. I have no doubt there are a good many pieces of legislation in there just as necessary as that. The auditor of the District calls especial attention to that. He says:

#### SPECIAL ASSESSMENT COLLECTIONS.

Attention is especially invited to the practice which obtains in the handling of collections received from special assessments for the construction of sidewalks, curbs, paving of alleys, and sewers, under the assessment and permit system, authorized by the act of August 7, 1894, and collections for opening, widening, etc., of alleys and minor streets, for which special assessments are laid for benefits resulting therefrom. All sums now collected on these several items are required under the law to be "repaid to current appropriations for similar purposes."

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. A portion of it. Mr. BORLAND. That is what has been becoming of it. They go back, or a portion of it, as the gentleman from Kentucky remarked. But a part of that which was originally contributed by the Federal Government has never gone back into the hands of the Government.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. And the Government is out

the interest.

Mr. BORLAND. And the Government is out the interest. So I believe, gentlemen, that a good deal of the contention of the people of the District of Columbia would be satisfied by the creation of a District committee clothed, as I have designated, with the power to appropriate and clothed with the powers over the courts and the general powers over the civil government of a State, which the District properly is. Then let the people of the District go to the District Committee as their forum, their legislative body, and that all measures of self-government and self-control that can be left to the people of the District should be left to them. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. I quite agree with the gentleman that no bill for a street opening should come upon the floor of this House. It should all be done by some authority here in the

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the

gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, as a result of certain inquiries with regard to the food supply of the people of the District of Columbia, I have prepared some remarks upon trusts, combinations, and cold storage, which I should like to have extended in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent for that

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD for the purpose indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The

Chair hears none.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has 56 minutes remaining.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield of that 56 minutes 45 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER], and I am under the impression that 15 minutes will be allowed him by the minority representative [Mr. Bowers].
Mr. BOWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas in order to make his time one hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 45 minutes in the time of the gentleman from Michigan and 15 minutes in the time of the gentleman from Mississippi. Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I am about to submit some observations to the House upon the subject of the

fortification of the Panama Canal; and while ordinarily I would be very glad to submit to any interruptions that any gentleman might desire to make, I have on this occasion committed to writing what I have to say, and therefore I would like not to be interrupted until I conclude my speech. At the close of my remarks I will be very glad to answer any questions which may be put to me concerning the subject matter of my address.

Mr. Chairman, the United States has recently undertaken the most important project of modern times—the construction of an Isthmian Canal, whereby the ocean commerce of the world may pass directly through the Isthmus of Panama and avoid the extended and dangerous trip around the southern extremity of the Western Hemisphere. This great enterprise has been undertaken by our Government without the aid or assistance of any other nation. The work is ours, the expense is ours, the maintenance of the canal when constructed will be ours, and the responsibility of interoceanic communication will remain ours until the end of time.

The Panama Zone, through which the canal is being constructed, is a part of the territory of the United States. sovereignty over it is supreme and is as exclusive as would be our sovereignty over a canal through the State of New York connecting the Great Lakes with the Hudson River or a canal connecting the waters of Lake Michigan with those of the Mississippi River. This Panama Canal is being constructed for two great purposes, the first and most important of which to us is to secure a direct and speedy water highway between our Atlantic and Pacific coasts. We have an extensive coast line on both of the great oceans of the world. To safeguard these coast lines we must maintain a great navy, and without an interoceanic canal we would not be safe from attack on either side of the continent without adequate navies occupying both oceans. Our experience in our war with Spain, when the battleship Oregon was sent around Cape Horn to strengthen our Atlantic Fleet, has taught us the practical impossibility of using our warships in either ocean in time of war for services in the opposite ocean, and our fleet on the one coast is of no practical use in the defense of the other coast. In this respect our position is unique and without the canal would compel us to maintain a great navy both on the east and on the west. With the canal properly safeguarded and under our own control our warships, wherever located, could be speedily concentrated to meet an attack by a foreign fleet on either side of the continent. To enable us to do this, to reduce our naval expenditures, and to safeguard our possessions is the great controlling purpose of our construction of an interoceanic canal.

Second. We are engaging in the establishment of a water highway to facilitate, cheapen, and encourage the commerce of the world. We are doing this at our own expense and upon our own responsibility, asking no aid or assistance from any other power. As a matter of fact, under present conditions this great work is almost exclusively for the benefit of foreign commerce and foreign commercial interests. Our own merchant ships passing through the constructed canal will carry but a small percentage of the ocean freight carried by foreign vessels between the two great oceans. We are proposing to give the other nations the use of this canal upon the same terms that we give to our own ocean carriers. We are proposing to bear the entire cost of construction and maintenance of the canal. It therefore seems that, from the commercial and transportation standpoints, we are engaged in a great philanthropic enterprise and are using our resources for the world's advantage. All other nations should be grateful to us for this incalculable benefit bestowed upon them without condition and without price.

We are pledged by convention with Great Britain and by implied promise to all nations not only to construct but to maintain and keep open to the world the navigation through the canal. Whatever is necessary to accomplish and secure this we must do. We are obligated to furnish the necessary means to complete the work, to supply the annual expenditure necessary to maintain and operate the canal, and are we not also bound to take whatever steps are required to prevent the possible contingency of the destruction of the canal or its temporary obstruction from any possible cause, whether that cause be some convulsion of nature or some seizure by the forces of a power hostile to us or engaged in warfare with another power? If there is possible danger to the canal from lawless persons on the Isthmus or from any revolution or insurrection in any of the countries near the canal, is it not our duty to provide, and provide in advance, for such effective policing of the line of the canal or for the maintenance of such an armed force at suitable points as will minimize the danger of any local attempt to destroy it or even temporarily prevent its free navigation? In like manner are we not also obligated to anticipate that the

era of peace on earth has not yet come? That wars may arise and that in those wars it may become of paramount interest to one of the belligerents to seize and hold the canal or to injure and blockade it? Wars come without much preliminary notice. They ofttimes come like lightning from a clear sky, and in the most profound calm of the world's affairs any morning sun may reveal the marshaling of armed hosts, the dispatch of powerful warships, or the seizure of some great seaport city or stronghold. Can it be doubted that a nation fronting on the Pacific Sea and having in that sea a fleet temporarily superior to any or all others would, in case of war with a nation having a superior fleet in the Atlantic Ocean, direct its first attack upon the Panama Canal, either to seize it, to destroy it, to disable it, or to blockade it? It will be said, of course, that no other nation engaged in war would care to provoke by any such act the hostility of the United States. That is simply argumentative, and may be true to-day, but who knows or can prophesy that such a situation will continue indefinitely?

We must not forget that none of the great powers so far. except Great Britain, have entered into any convention with us guaranteeing the freedom of the canal to the commerce of the world or to the warships of the world. None of them so far are bound to assist us in preserving the neutrality of the canal. At the most, as the situation now stands, we have but the guaranty of the United States and the consent of Great Briain as against the whole world. Not only is this true, but, as I have already said, the United States is under implied obligation to keep this canal open in time of peace and in time of war continuously and perpetually to all the shipping of the seas. This implied obligation of ours would hold good if war should arise between our Government and that of Great Britain. Should such a war ever come, which God forbid, our treaty with Great Britain would be swept away and single handed and alone, in addition to carrying on such a war, we would be compelled to use whatever of our Army and Navy strength might be necessary to keep the canal open for the use of other nations.

The question then arises, How shall we safeguard this great national work; how shall we safeguard it for our own protection; how shall we safeguard it to guarantee our implied obligation that it shall remain open to the commerce of all countries? I propose to discuss this question from two standpoints.

First. What ought we to do, what could we properly do, what would we be virtually obligated to do to protect this canal in case there were no outstanding treaties between our Government and any other on this question? I have already said that the so-called Panama Canal Zone through which the canal is constructed is a part of the territory of the United States; that our occupation of it is exclusive; that our jurisdiction over it is supreme; that the canal in one sense of the word is an improved waterway wholly within the territorial limits of our country. This proposition may be controverted, but I do not think it can be successfully. By the convention concluded November 18, 1903, between the United States and the Republic of Panama it is provided in Article II that Panama—

grants to the United States in perpetuity the use, occupation, and control of a zone of land and land under water for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of said canal.

The article further grants-

in perpetuity the use, occupation, and control of any other lands and waters outside of the zone above described which may be necessary and convenient for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the said canal or of any auxiliary canals or other works necessary and convenient for the construction, operation, sanitation, and protection of the said enterprise.

Article III further provides that-

the Republic of Panama grants to the United States all the rights, power, and authority which the United States would possess and exercise if it were the sovereign of the territory within which said lands and waters are located to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power, or authority.

The language above quoted was most carefully considered by both of the contracting parties. In using this particular language it was evidently in contemplation that the United States might fail in the construction of a practicable canal or that it might at some future time abandon it, or that in some great conflict of the future it might be wrested from us by conquest, and in any such case Panama evidently reserves the right to reoccupy, retake, and reassert sovereignty over the Canal Zone, but in the meantime and until some such contingency might arise we are given the right of exclusive occupation, use, control, and sovereignty, and to all intents and purposes, I again repeat, this Canal Zone is a part of the territory of the United States. What we do within this territory is to be decided by the American people.

The only limitation upon our power to act, to protect, to fortify, is the limitation of the American conscience, unless we are limited in this respect by our existing convention with Great Britain. Not only is this so, but our treaty with Panama obligates us to guarantee the safety and protection of the canal, of the ships that make use of the same, and of the railways and auxiliary works connected therewith, for we find Article XXIII of the treaty reads:

If it should become necessary at any time to employ armed forces for the safety or protection of the canal, or of the ships that make use of the same, or the railways and auxiliary works, the United States shall have the right, at all times and in its discretion, to use its police and its land and naval forces, or to establish fortifications for these purposes.

I have no doubt we would have had that right without any stipulation on the subject, but the insertion of said article makes it certain that at the time the treaty was entered into both Panama and the United States contemplated that for the protection of both, as well as of the canal itself and of the shipping of the world, it might and undoubtedly would be necessary to so protect the completed canal as to make attack upon it impossible or of a character not to endanger its maintenance.

Any thoughtful man must see that under any circumstances our Government must protect this canal. It must protect it from any convulsions of nature. It must protect it from any troublesome conditions that may exist in adjacent territory. It must protect it from the assault of the seas, of the storms and the floods, and it must protect it from any possible interference by the armed forces of any other nation. How and to what extent this protection is necessary is a question to be decided by the United States. Whether it requires military stations, considerable numbers of troops, the stationing of warships in its immediate vicinity, or the construction of works of fortification, defensive or offensive, we must determine. In determining this we must consider our duty toward the Republic of Panama. That Republic was evidently induced to enter into convention because of the expected and extraordinary value to it of a canal such as we are constructing and located We are in duty bound to meet the expectation of where it is. the people of Panama to give them this canal and to maintain it in perpetuity. I think I would be justified in asserting that if we should permit this canal to be destroyed at any future time, where extreme prudence and foresight on our part could have prevented, we would forfeit all our rights under the treaty, we would forfeit our right to occupy the territory or to exercise sovereignty over it, and the zone would revert to and become again a part of the domain of the Republic of Panama.

Our obligation to the world to maintain the canal is of the gravest possible character. We are taking the responsibility of changing the great ocean route between the Atlantic and the We are bringing the navies of Europe within striking distance of the Asiatic coast and we are bringing the navies of the Orient within striking distance of the eastern shore of the Western Continent. We are, in a way, minimizing the safety of isolation and distance, which up to the present time have formed a substantial part of the protective power of all the nations bordering either upon the Atlantic or upon the Pacific. These nations must adjust themselves to the changed conditions. may be necessary for them to increase their navies, to add to their coast fortifications and defenses, and when they do adjust themselves to the new relations and conditions established by the Panama Canal they have a right to look to us for the perpetual maintenance of the canal and to hold us responsible if that great waterway should suffer destruction when it might have been within our power to prevent it. We must decide upon the question of fortification from the standpoint of to-day and the horoscope of the future. Whatever public opinion in this country, in Great Britain, or elsewhere may have been 60 years ago, we must not overlook the fact that conditions have materially and wonderfully changed since then. At that time but few, if any, contemplated the speedy development of a great, powerful, warlike nation in the Orient, but to-day the experts of the world are seriously discussing as to whether our Pacific is not open to the successful attack of the present Japan or the future great oriental nation that is rapidly being developed on the far side of the Pacific. Mr. Chairman, we are not contemplating war .- We are at peace and hope and expect to remain at peace indefinitely with all other nations. but war may come and no human foresight can tell or predict To insure our own peace and safety, to assist in conserving the peace of all other nations, it is our duty to leave nothing undone which we can do to so protect ourselves by land and by sea that no one nation or number of nations combined will dare to declare war upon the United States. To do this, we must fortify our great seaport towns, and if we are to fortify

them, why are we not also bound to fortify the Isthmian Canal, which, in the opinion of the highest naval and military authorities, is essential to the protection of our entire seacoast? Much is being said about the safety of the United States by reason of the extraordinary and advantageous position it occupies, extending entirely across the continent, gridironed by great railway lines, filled with manufacturing establishments of every kind and character, and having within its borders millions of men ready at a moment's notice to rally around the flag, but our experience in the late war with Spain teaches us that our unparalleled resources can not be made use of at a moment's notice. Our navies are scattered in both oceans. They can not concentrate in a day or a month at any particular point, nor would it be safe in time of danger upon either coast to withdraw our Navy from the other coast, leaving that open and unprotected from any enemy that might see fit to take advantage of our situation.

I am saying nothing here as to our responsibility and future danger in the Philippines, but they are grave enough to cause us great anxiety. I am of those who hope for universal peace, for the time coming when the tramp of armies shall no longer shake the earth or the iron monsters of the deep meet in naval We do not maintain our Army, we do not build our battleships, we do not forge our guns, we do not fortify our coasts with warlike intent. We do all these things to guarantee our peace, to protect our people and our interests from any probability of danger or destruction. We are not constructing the Panama Canal with any thought of using it as a menace to any other country. We are a great commercial, Christian, busy, peace-loving people. In the century and a third of our independence we have only waged war five times, and never in an unworthy cause, never for conquest or dominion, never for the increase of power and prestige. I say we have only waged war five times—first, in 1776, that the pioneers and patriots of the New World might have the right to institute government for themselves, government of the people, by the people, and for the people; second, in 1812, that an American seaman might be as safe upon the sea as upon the land, and that the deck of every American ship might become American soil; third, in 1847, that the infant Republic of Texas might have the right of her own free will to set her star of statehood shining in the azure of our flag; fourth, in 1861, that the inherited curse of human slavery might vanish from our civilization, and that this Union of States, this great mother Republic, should not perish from the earth; and fifth, in 1898, that the downtrodden, oppressed, and suffering people of the island of Cuba might, as did our forefathers, throw off the yoke of foreign tyranny and take their own destiny into their own hands. The world does not fear us as an aggressive power. It knows that nothing but the direst necessity would cause us to engage in warfare. world knows that we cast no longing eyes upon any other possessions than our own. The world knows that as a people we are united in the encouragement of the settlement of all international differences by arbitration and international tribunals.

Sixty years ago other nations may have, and probably did, look upon our proposed construction of an isthmian canal as a possible danger and menace. That time has passed away. The sentiment of civilization has changed. No great nation has so far even suggested a protest against our treaty with Panama, our acquisition of the Canal Zone, or our purpose of fortifying and protecting the canal. In fact, it is fairly certain that all of the great powers are now anxious and glad that the United States has assumed not only the entire expenditure for the canal, but the sole responsibility of maintaining and operating it. Fortified, it guarantees its free and unobstructed use by the commerce of the world. Left unprotected, it endangers the commerce, the peace, and the safety of all the great civilized powers.

Our right and our purpose to construct this canal, to hold it under our own control, to protect it in whatever way we may deem necessary is not of recent assertion. I need go no further back than to cite from the message of President Hayes in his special message to Congress of March 8, 1880, in which he said:

special message to Congress of March 8, 1880, in which he said:

The policy of this country is a canal under American control. The
United States can not consent to the surrender of this control to any
European power or to any combination of European powers.

An interoceanic canal across the American isthmus will essentially
change the geographical relations between the Atlantic and Pacific
coast of the United States and between the United States and the rest
of the world. It will be the great ocean thoroughfare between our
Atlantic and Pacific shores, and virtually a part of the coast line of the
United States. Our merely commercial interest in it is greater than
that of all other countries, while its relations to our power and prosperity as a nation, to our means of defense, our unity, peace, and safety,
are matters of paramount concern to the people of the United States.
No other great power would, under similar circumstances, fall to assert
a rightful control over a work so closely and vitally affecting its interests and welfare.

This was not a new declaration, but it summarized the whole proposition. Since that time we have been endeavoring to relieve ourselves from the supposed obligation of the so-called Clayton-Bulwer treaty of April 19, 1850, under which it was contended, but never expressly admitted by us, that we were obligated not to fortify an isthmian canal should one be constructed. Negotiations on this subject finally resulted in the convention known as the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, proclaimed February 22, 1902, after due ratification by both contracting parties, Great Britain and the United States. This instrument is entitled a "Treaty to facilitate the construction of a ship canal," and recites that it was negotiated because of the desire of both parties, among other things-

to remove any objection which may arise out of the convention of the 19th of April, 1850, commonly called the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, to the construction of such canal under the auspices of the Government of the United States without impairing the "general principle" of neutralization established in Article VIII of that convention, have for that purpose appointed as their plenipotentiaries, etc.

Article I of said treaty is as follows:

The high contracting parties agree that the present treaty shall super-sede the aforementioned convention of the 19th of April, 1850.

There can be no doubt that this last treaty is the only treaty which in any way limits, confines, or controls the United States in the matter of the fortification of the canal. The differences of opinion between Great Britain and the United States as to the true meaning and construction of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty were the subject of long, earnest, diplomatic discussion between the representatives of the two countries, and at times this discussion and these differences excited considerable feeling and caused more or less irritation on both sides of the Atlantic, but, as I have already said, our last convention supersedes the old one, and to it, and to it alone, we must look for any possible limitation upon our right to fortify the canal.

I do not think it is necessary to consider but a small part of this treaty on this particular question. Article III, sections 1 and 2, read as follows:

and 2, read as follows:

The canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations observing these rules on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any such nation, or its citizens or subjects, in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic or otherwise. Such conditions and charges of traffic shall be just and equitable.

The canal shall never be blockaded, nor shall any right of war be exercised nor any act of hostility be committed within it. The United States, however, shall be at liberty to maintain such military police along the canal as may be necessary to protect it against lawlessness and disorder.

Article III of this treaty sets forth certain rules as to the "neutralization" of the canal. These are substantially similar to those of the convention of Constantinople, signed October 28, 1888. There are, however, significant differences; for instance, in Article I of the convention of Constantinople it is declared:

The Suez Maritime Canal shall always be free and open, in time of war as in time of peace, to every vessel of commerce or of war, without distinction of flag. Consequently the high contracting parties agree not in any way to interfere with the free use of the canal, in time of war as in time of peace.

Article IV has the following provision:

The maritime canal remaining open in time of war as a free passage, even to the ships of war of belligerents \* \* \* even though the Ottoman Empire should be one of the belligerent powers. even though the

The underlying words of the two provisions just quoted do not appear in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, and must necessarily have been omitted by design and because the parties, or at least one of the parties, would not consent to the same.

In considering the construction to be placed upon the Hay-Pauncefote treaty we must not overlook the fact of the radical difference in the situation of these two canals. Great Britain, in taking over a majority control of the Suez Canal and undertaking the responsibility of its operation, was entirely safe in guaranteeing its neutralization and in consenting to an open, unfortified highway from the Mediterranean to the Red Sea. She understood perfectly that this canal was located upon the waters of the Mediterranean, open to the fleets of France, Italy, Austria, Germany, Russia, and Turkey. England also knew that she held the outlet of the Red Sea, or could hold it by proper fortifications, against all the world, and while she did agree to refrain from the erection of fortifications on the line of the canal itself, she did not bind herself not to fortify the outlet to and beyond it at her pleasure, and this she has for-tified, is fortifying, and those fortifications constitute a prac-tical blockade, that can be enforced against the ships of the tical blockade, that can be enforced against the ships of the world whenever Great Britain desires. Again, the frowning guns of the impregnable Gibraltar hold the entrance of the Mediterranean at the will of Great Britain as against the combined fleets of all the great powers, so that Great Britain has a virtual blockade by fortifications at both real termini of the waterway perfected by the construction of the Suez Canal.

The situation at the Isthmus is entirely and radically different. Both ends of the canal face the open ocean. No fortification, no protection could be established unless such fortification and such protection is maintained upon the line of the canal itself or at the entrances on either side of the Isthmus.

I would be the last man to advocate the breaking or avoidance of any of our international treaty stipulations. What I am arguing here is that for many years before the negotiations of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty this Government had had in contemplation the construction of the canal. It gradually formed the resolution to construct it as a Government enterprise, to eliminate the participation not only of all other nations but also of all private interests. In other words, we determined to build the canal as a national enterprise. The United States, while reaching this conclusion and after reaching it, as is shown in all public debates upon the question and in all our diplomatic negotiations with Great Britain, as far as the same are made public, has insisted upon reserving the right and assuming the responsibility of protecting the canal by any means deemed necessary, and our purpose at all times has been freely disclosed and understood by Great Britain to be to safeguard the canal in the only possible adequate way—by fortification. It is, in view of this situation, difficult—yes, impossible—to believe that any possible construction that can be placed upon any or all of the provisions of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty binds this Government to a policy of "nonfortification." Indeed, as I have already suggested, our efforts to abrogate the former treaty were because of our desire to relieve ourselves of its provisions should we deem it necessary to protect the canal by fortifications. Our general purpose to do this, as shown by debates in Congress, by state papers, and as represented by the general wishes of our people, has at all times been known to Great Britain, and up to the present time I do not know that any objection to our so doing has been made upon the part of Great Britain or that any claim is suggested that our present treaty stipulations prohibit us from so doing. This is significant and should relieve us from any fear that our decision of this matter can cause the slightest feeling on the part of Great Britain or subject us to the charge of not living up to the strict letter of an international convention.

Our duty in the premises and our right under the Hay-Pauncefore treaty has been the subject of messages from the President of the United States to Congress, all of which have been known to the world and have been received by the world without protest or serious criticism. I think that no American can read the President's message of December 6, 1910, on this subject without feeling that his recommendation of fortification gives complete and unanswerable reasons for such action on our part. He says:

on our part. He says:

Among questions arising for present solution is whether the canal shall be fortified. I have already stated to the Congress that I strongly favor fortification, and I now reiterate this opinion and ask your consideration of the subject in the light of the report already before you, made by a competent board.

If, in our discretion, we believe modern fortifications to be necessary to the adequate protection and policing of the canal, then it is our duty to construct them. We have built the canal. It is our property, By convention we have indicated our desire for and, indeed, undertaken its universal and equal use. It is also well known that one of the chief objects in the construction of the canal has been to increase the military effectiveness of our Navy.

Failure to fortify the canal would make the attainment of both these aims depend upon the mere moral obligations of the whole international public, obligations which we would be powerless to enforce and which could never in any other way be absolutely safeguarded against a desperate and irresponsible enemy.

I have for our present Executive the highest admiration and

I have for our present Executive the highest admiration and regard. I believe his to be one of the master minds of the age. He is a great, patriotic, honest, conscientious man. His long experience as a jurist, his wide familiarity with public affairs, give a weight to his opinion that should carry conviction to every He finds no reasons in the Hay-Pauncefore treaty that stand in the way of protecting the canal by any means we deem best. He sees in such action no possible violation of an international convention, and I am sure he would be the last man in this country to tolerate the idea of a breach of our diplomatic faith. It must be remembered that the President of the United States is the one man of all others best qualified to advise Congress as to the rights and duties of this country under the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. He is in possession of all the confidential diplomatic correspondence which leads up to its formulation and ratification. He knows all the diplomatic negotiations which antedated and culminated in the treaty. All this knowledge is only possessed in this country by the Executive, certain officials of the State Department, and the United States Senate. It can not be made public without violating the ethics of international diplomacy, but the President of the United States knows it all, and it is his duty to determine and decide and to advise Congress in the light of this knowledge as to what is proper for Congress to do in the matter of providing for protection of the Therefore when the President asks Congress to fortify the canal he gives his official sanction not only to the proposition that fortification is necessary for its protection and to enable this Government to meet its implied obligation to keep the canal open for the world, but he also assures Congress and the country that there will be no infringement of any provision of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty in so doing. As I have already stated, the negotiations leading up to this treaty, covering a period of years, had in view the express desire of the United

First. To abrogate the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. This was accomplished by the specific agreement of the new treaty.

Second. At the time of the ratification of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty it was contemplated that an isthmian canal, if constructed, would be constructed as a business venture by private capital, and that the United States, as a Government, would have no part in the matter except authorizing and guaranteeing the enterprise. In that treaty, therefore, it was stipulated that neither Great Britain nor the United States should acquire sovereignty over any of the territory of the Isthmus. When our purpose changed and we decided to build the canal as a Government project, to pay for it from the public funds, to possess and maintain it as a Nation, it was necessary to secure the abrogation of the last-stated provision of the old treaty. This was secured by the new treaty, and the United States, with the consent of Great Britain, was placed in a position where it could acquire territory and exercise sovereignty over the necessary zone within which the canal might be constructed.

Third. Under the Clayton-Bulwer treaty there was a joint obligation of Great Britain and the United States to maintain the neutrality of the canal. It can be fairly asserted, without disclosing the diplomatic negotiations, that Great Britain consented to our acquisition of territory and to our exercise of sovereignty over it, and for the reason that it relieved Great Britain from her obligation to participate in maintaining and guaranteeing to the world the neutrality and freedom of the canal, and it will be noticed that whereas the Clayton-Bulwer treaty pledged the two Governments to enforce the rules of nentrality prescribed for the use of the canal, the new treaty freed Great Britain from all responsibility and obligation originally

imposed upon her jointly with ourselves.

Under the new treaty the United States alone, as the sole owner of the canal, as a purely American enterprise, adopts and prescribes the rules by which the use of the canal shall be regulated, and assumes the entire responsibility and burden of enforcing, without the assistance of Great Britain or of any other nation, its absolute neutrality. Therefore, the United States is left by the new treaty free to meet its obligations in this respect in its own way, and by those means which we may decide are

necessary for and will best enable us to do so.

Fourth. Under the old treaty other nations were invited to participate in and become parties to the guaranty of the neutrality of the canal. It is a matter of common knowledge that Great Britain insisted that the modifications asked by the United States, if agreed to, would place her at a great disadvantage in case of war between our two nations, as such a war would necessarily abrogate or suspend our treaty contract, and at the same time would lead to any other nation participating in the guaranty of neutrality the free use of the canal for both warlike and commercial purposes. It was therefore of utmost importance to Great Britain that the United States alone should undertake the neutrality of the canal, and that Great Britain should be relieved from her participation in that respect.

For this reason the provision of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, guaranteeing neutrality and the free passage of ships of war as well as of commerce through the canal at all times, was modified by the elimination from that clause of the treaty of the words "in time of war as in time of peace." It was con-sidered that the omission of these words would mean that war between the contracting parties or between the United States and any other power would have the ordinary effect of war upon treaties when not specifically otherwise provided, and would remit both parties to their original right of self-defense and give to the United States the clear right to close the canal against the other belligerent and to protect it and defend it by whatever means might be necessary. The purpose of the elimination of the former provision that the high contracting parties would immediately upon the exchange of ratifications bring said treaty to the notice of other powers and invite them to adhere to it was not only well understood, but was to the specific advantage of Great Britain. It was further believed that the declaration that the canal should be free

and open to all nations on terms of entire equality (now that Great Britain was relieved of all responsibility and obligation to enforce and defend its neutrality) would practically meet the force of the objection made by Great Britain to the exclusion of the former article inviting the other powers to act in, viz, that Great Britain was placed thereby in a worse position than other nations in case of war with the United

Fifth. It will be noted that one of the most important changes from the language of the former treaty is the omission of the provision which prohibited the fortification of the canal and the retention of a provision that the United States shall be at liberty to maintain such military police along the canal as may be necessary to protect it against lawlessness and

disorder.

The whole theory of the treaty is that the canal is to be an entirely American canal. The enormous cost of protecting it is to be borne by the United States alone. When constructed it is to be exclusively the property of the United States, and is to be managed, controlled, and defended by it. Under the circumstances, and considering that now by the new treaty Great Britain is relieved of all of the responsibility and burden of maintaining its neutrality and security, it was entirely den of maintaining its neutrality and security, it was entirely fair to omit the prohibition that "no fortification shall be erected commanding the canal or the waters adjacent."

The objection of the United States to invite the agreement of other powers to the contract for the neutralization and free use of the canal was because of our strong national feeling against giving to other powers in the nature of a contract right in an affair so peculiarly American as the canal. We insisted that no other powers had acquired or held any right in the premises, or had anything to give up or part with as consideration for acquiring such a contract right. We insisted that these other powers must rely on the good faith of the United States in its declaration to Great Britain in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty that it would maintain the neutrality of the canal, and that it adopted the rules and principles of neutralization in said treaty set forth. These rules, it is evident, were adopted in the treaty with Great Britain as a consideration for getting out of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and the only way in which other nations are bound by them is that they must comply with them if they would use the canal. It was in view of this that the clause of the treaty finally agreed upon is as follows:

The canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations observing these rules on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any such nation.

Thus the whole idea of contract right in other powers was eliminated, and our guaranty is only to those nations observing our neutrality rules, and the vessels of any nation which refused or failed to observe the rules adopted or prescribed may be deprived of the use of the canal.

Our negotiations for a treaty with the Republic of Panama followed almost immediately the ratification of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. The latter was proclaimed February 22, 1902, and our treaty with Panama was concluded November 8, 1903. I have already referred to the fact that Article XXIII of the Panama treaty gives the United States, in its discretion, the

to use its police and its land and naval forces or to establish fortifications.

The terms of the treaty have been known to the British Government for more than seven years, and up to the present time no intimation has come from the Government that this stipulation of the Panama treaty is in any way in contravention of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. It is impossible to believe that Great Britain, always alive to her international interests, would have remained silent and made no objection if it intended to hold or insist that we were prohibited by the Hay-Pauncefote treaty from protecting the canal by fortifications. Is it not clear then that our Government in 1903, in securing such a stipulation from the Republic of Panama and the British Government in interposing no objection thereto, have both construed the Hay-Pauncefote treaty as containing nothing which would stand in our way of taking such steps as we might decide best

to protect the canal?

The President of the United States in his special message of January 12, 1911, again presents this matter to Congress in

the following statement:

The canal when completed will afford the only convenient route for water communication between our Atlantic and Pacific coasts and virtually will be a part of the coast line of the United States. Its assured possession and control will contribute to our peace, safety, and prosperity as a Nation.

In my judgment it is the right and the duty of the United States to fortify and make capable of defense the work that will bear so vital a relation to its welfare and that is being created solely by it and at an expenditure of enormous sums.

Mr. Chairman, to summarize the whole proposition, no nation except Great Britain has any agreement with us as to the canal and can not interpose any valid objection to any action deemed necessary by the United States for its protection.

The President of the United States assures us that the fortification of the canal in no way violates our treaty stipula-tions with Great Britain. Great Britain does not suggest that there is any limitation in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty to the exercise of our own discretion in this matter.

Our action, therefore, must be governed by our own decision

as to the best interests of our own country.

We are investing at least \$400,000,000 in this great undertaking. It is improbable that the tolls upon commerce passing through the canal will give us-at least in the near futureany adequate annual return upon our investment. Is it a part of wisdom to neglect the doing of anything that can be done to guarantee the continued protection of the canal and of our great investment in it?

I insist that as a mere matter of insurance we should fortify the canal. The President advises us that the cost of fortifica-tion as at present contemplated is \$12,475,328. This is cer-tainly a comparatively small sum if it is to be treated as an insurance premium. No patriotic American will quibble over the expenditure of such a sum of money to make certain the safety

of the canal.

It is suggested that we can safeguard the canal by stationing our warships at either entrance, but if warships are to be permanently detailed for that purpose the cost to the United States of such ships would greatly exceed the amount for per-

manent fortifications.

In addition to this, we need and will need our warships for other purposes. To station them at the canal entrances will withdraw them from our fleets, and will to that extent weaken and reduce our naval power upon the high seas, and at the same time the protection afforded by those battleships will be of doubtful value as compared with the certainty of protection afforded by permanent fortifications.

Mr. Chairman, our fortification of the canal is within our It appeals to our wisdom and common sense. It gives the protection afforded in no other way to our own unobstructed use and control of the canal in time of peace and in time of war. It is the most economical method of safeguarding our rights. It is our best possible guaranty to the commerce of the world of the neutralization and free passage of the canal.

I therefore appeal to the business sense and to the patriotism of the American people for the appropriation of the necessary moneys to carry out the recommendation of the President of

the United States.

Mr. Chairman, on January 16, 1911, there appeared in all the leading newspapers a statement issued by certain distinguished. philanthropic, and well-meaning American citizens, setting forth their reasons why the Panama Canal should not be fortified. Their statement is as follows:

1. Because the canal would be safer in war time without fortifica-tion. According to the agreement signed by The Hague Conference in 1907 unfortified coast places can not be bombarded.

## GOVERNMENT'S ORIGINAL PLAN.

2. Because the original intention of our Government, as distinctly expressed in 1908, and previously, was to prohibit fortifications on the canal.

canal.

3. Because, though the Suez Canal was built with English money, England agreed to its neutralization. The Straits of Magelian are also neutralized, and the Interparliamentary Union in 1910 declared in favor of the neutralization of all interoceanic waterways.

4. Because the United States, in all its history, has never been attacked, and began every foreign war it ever had, and is too important a customer for any great nation at this late day to wantonly attack

\* \* \*.

attacked, and began every portant a customer for any great nation at this late day to wantomy attack.

5. Because with the experience of nearly a century's peace with England, insured by our undefended Canadian border line, until we have asked for complete arbitration treaties with all possible future enemies and have been refused, we should be insincere in increasing our war measures. This is especially true in view of the facts that, since 1902, the nations have signed 100 arbitration treaties, and President Taft has made the impressive declaration that he sees no reason why any question whatever should not be arbitrated; that the second Hague Conference in various ways diminished the likelihood of war; that not only the prize court, but the court of arbitral justice is practically assured; and that in the summer of 1910 Congress unanimously passed a resolution asking the President to appoint a commission of five to consider the utilization of existing agencies to limit the armaments of the world by mutual agreement of the nations and to constitute the world navies an international force for the preservation of universal peace and to consider other means to diminish expenditures for military purposes.

COST OF PROPOSED FORTIFICATIONS.

6. Because, in the words of Hon. David J. Foster, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the House of Representatives, "the initial expenses of the necessary fortifications would not be less than \$25,000,000; in all probability it would not be less than \$50,000,000. The annual expense of maintaining such fortifications, 2,000 miles from home, would probably amount to \$5,000,000. With all the fortifications possible, it is still apparent that in order that the canal might be of military advantage to the United Stafes in time of war a guard of battleships at each of its entrances would be an absolute necessity.

It is equally apparent that with a guard the fortifications would be unnecessary, if not entirely useless. We are bound by solemn treaty obligations to see to it that the canal shall be and remain forever open to British ships in time of war, as well as in time of peace, and while it is probably true that no other nation could claim any advantage by virtue of this treaty, it is also true that we have thereby placed ourselves under moral obligations to maintain an open canal for the ships of all nations at all times, in war as well as in peace."

I feel that before concluding my remarks on this subject I should, in a brief way, analyze some of the reasons they give in opposition to the President's recommendation of fortification, and I further propose to comment upon and, if possible, show the fallacy of the position they take.

They oppose fortification, first-

Because the canal would be safer in war time without fortification. According to the agreement signed by The Hague Conference in 1907, unfortified coast places can not be bombarded.

It is difficult to understand the statement that an unfortified canal would be safer from attack than a fortified canal. This alleged safety is based entirely upon the agreement formulated by The Hague Conference. That agreement is undoubtedly binding upon the consciences of all the signatory powers so long as peace conditions prevail, but who believes or imagines that an agreement would prevent a nation waging war against another from taking whatever warlike action might be deemed best for its advantage and success? In case of war against the United States would our enemy refrain from bombarding a work like the Isthmian Canal if to do so would close it against the attack of a superior fleet at the other ocean entrance and ready to steam through and overpower its adversary?

Such agreements as that of The Hague are well enough in their way and undoubtedly tend toward the settlement of in-ternational differences and thereby make war less probable, but we must deal with the possibility that notwithstanding all peace movements wars may still be waged. If there is to be no more war, what objection can there be to fortifying the canal, for such fortification can in no way be a menace to the world's commerce or to the interests of any other power? Again, The Hague Conference contains no agreement that an unfortified city or other place on the seacoast may not be attacked and taken by an enemy, and without a fortification on the canal what would prevent an enemy, without bombardment, from landing a sufficient force, taking possession of the canal, and holding or wrecking it as the enemy might see fit?

One of the natural results of the completion of the canal will be the construction of a naval base in its immediate vicinity. If our warships are to be stationed at either entrance of the canal it will be absolutely essential that a naval base be maintained where these ships can rendezvous, and from which, upon a moment's notice, they can sally forth on either ocean as occasion may demand. The establishment of such a naval base would be no more an evidence of belligerent intent than is the fact that we build warships and maintain a Navy. A battleship is a formidable floating armament equal to its work while in condition, but once crippled or short of supplies or ammunition it must speedily reach an established base to recruit its strength. It goes without saying that such a base must be fortified so that disabled or temporarily exhausted naval vessels may be protected while refitting.

Second. The gentlemen in formulating their opposition to fortification allege that it was the original intention of our Government, as distinctly expressed in 1908 and previously, to

prohibit fortification of the canal.

In this statement they are clearly in error. As I have already shown, we negotiated our treaty with Panama in 1903, under which we asked for and secured the specific right to fortify the canal, and no official action or expression of this Government since that time shows any other or different purpose. As I have already argued at considerable length, one of the principal objects of the negotiations leading up to the Hay-Pauncefore treaty was to rid ourselves of the stipulation against fortification contained in the former Clayton-Bulwer treaty.

Third. These gentlemen insist that we should not fortify our canal because England agreed to the neutralization of the Suez Canal, because the Straits of Magellan are also neutralized, and because the Interparliamentary Union in 1910 de-clared in favor of the neutralization of all interoceanic water-

ways.

It seems to me these gentlemen do not have the same understanding that I have of what "neutralization" means, or, at least, of what our promise of free pasage through the canal to the vessels of all nations observing our conditions guarantees. We do agree not to close the canal in time of war or in time We do agree to give passage through this canal at all of peace. of peace. We to agree to give passage through this can't are times to the vessels of all nations. What better evidence of our good faith can be given than to fortify the canal and thereby place us in a condition where we can, without fear of interference by the happening of any war, guarantee free and unobstructed passage through the canal? The promise we make of so-called "neutralization" has no other guaranty than our good faith. This good faith is not broken by taking such steps as we deem are necessary to enable us to perform our

No man believes that this country would permit a nation at war with us to use this canal for the purpose of making an effective attack upon our coast or upon our Navy, and no one will contend that we have bartered away or foresworn the right to protect our country in time of war in any way that our national safety may require. Again, as I have already shown, the situation of the Suez Canal, so far as Great Britain's control over it is concerned, is in no wise like unto the Panama Canal and its relation to our governmental necessities.

Fourth. These gentlemen insist that the United Statesis too important a customer for any great nation at this late day to

Over the future hangs the impenetrable veil, and beyond it we can not see, but we do know this: That the best guaranty of our perpetual peace and freedom from attack lies in the eternal vigilance and adequacy of our preparation to render an attack upon us futile. You might just as well advocate the leveling of our fortificatinos that now protect New York, the great metropolis of this Nation, upon the same reasons these gentlemen advance, that there has been an international agreement to refrain from the bombardment of an unfortified city, and that, in any event, there will never be waged a war against Who is unmindful of the apprehension of the people of our great seaport towns at the beginning of the Spanish-American War? Who believes that should a war come our enemy would hesitate to precipitate his forces upon one of our great unprotected cities, to hold it, to levy tribute upon it, to demoralize our internal commerce, to blockade our great transportation lines, and to cripple us in a successful defense against an in-Who believes that fortification is a menace to any other nation unless that nation wages war upon us? And what American would dare take the responsibility of directing the abolishment of all our coast fortifications there?

Fifth. These gentlemen call attention to the fact that the

nations of the world-

have signed 100 arbitration treaties, and President Taft has made the impressive declaration that he sees no reason why any question whatever should not be arbitrated.

They also say that the Second Hague Conference in various ways diminished the likelihood of war, that Congress has passed a resolution asking the President to appoint a commission to consider means for limiting the armaments of the world by mutual agreement. All these things are healthy and hopeful signs of the increasing wish and desire of the Christian civilized world to avoid warfare and to establish universal peace. Up to the present time, however, all these things are no more nor less than the expression of the desire on the part of the people of the nations of the world. No mutual covenant has been entered into by which a combination of nations agrees to interfere in case war should arise, and if war comes either to this country or to any other these paper conventions, these expressions of desire for peace, these promises of mutual effort to secure disarmament will be swept aside by the tempests of war as the sands of the desert are swept away by the mighty whirlwinds that sometimes pass over them. One battleship, one fortified stronghold at the canal will do more to secure the world's peace and the dispersement of her armies than all the "goodypromises made by peace-loving representatives at a dozen international conferences. As against all these wellmeaning but nonguaranteed promises of disarmament, of wars no more to be, I submit the following table, published in the American Press on January 17, 1911:

American Press on January 17, 1911:

While the press of the world is shouting for peace and Senator Roor and his colleagues are working out a plan to spend Andrew Carnegie's \$10,000,000 peace fund, figures from the British naval authorities today show that 1911 will break all records for battleship launchings and naval activity.

These figures show that every nine days from February 1 to December 31 a new Dreadnought will take the water in some part of the globe. In other words, 36 Dreadnoughts will be launched this year, or only two less than the total number already affoat, as the result of five years' building.

In addition to this, innumerable small cruisers, torpedo boats, destroyers, and submarines will be launched by all the big powers. Great Britain alone will send 61 of such smaller war craft into the water.

water.

Of the Dreadnoughts, Great Britain easily leads the list with 11 to be launched this year. February 1 the 32,500-ton Thunderer will leave the slips at Blackwall, just outside London, and from then on there will be a regular succession of big splashes.

Germany comes second in naval activity and will launch 7 Dreadnoughts during the year. The United States will launch 3, in addition to the Arkansas, which slipped down the ways Saturday; Russia, 4; France, 2; Argentina, 2; Chile, 2; Japan, 2; and Italy, Austria, Brazil, and Spain, 1 each.

Altogether, it is stated, 70 Dreadnoughts and cruisers, with a tonnage of more than 1,500,000 and valued at more than \$700,000,000, are now under construction throughout the world. Great Britain has 250,000 tons on the builder's stocks and a tonnage of 128,000 launched and nearing completion. Germany has 150,000 tonnage building and 125,000 fitting out. France is building 46,000 tons and fitting out 110,000, and the United States is building 80,000 tons and fitting out 70,000 tons.

Is it not apparent that all the great nations are still increasing their navies, are still strengthening their fortifications, are still preparing for their own safety and tranquillity in the only way in which it can be guaranteed?

I read with approval the strong statement of our position found in the editorial column of the Washington Post on

January 16 last, as follows:

January 16 last, as follows:

The building of the Panama Canal involves immense considerations of commercial enterprise and development, and of all the related factors of peace and prosperity. The perpetuation of these features can be no better assured, nor can the maintenance of peutrality in the use of the canal, should two belligerent nations seek its advantages, be more certainly enforced than by the erection of impregnable fortifications at its approaches.

The canal is built and owned by the United States. It should be so protected that no enemy may destroy it. The United States must keep the canal in its own hands, absolutely safe from foreign interference. The short route between our coasts will be equivalent to doubling the size of the Navy. No possible enemy should have it in its power to reduce our Navy to half by destroying the canal.

No better, stronger statement of the true American position can be made.

Mr. Chairman, the only other reason urged in the nonfortification propaganda I have already read is a matter of cost. I have already discussed that question, but I wish to reiterate that the cost is a mere bagatelle compared with the tremendous importance of the enterprise and the danger of irreparable injury to us if we leave it open to attack. Not only is this true, but it does not require figures to demonstrate that we can with safety maintain a much smaller navy, of greater efficiency, if we can rely upon a protected canal than we would dare to depend upon if no canal is constructed, or if we must have fleets on both oceans adequate to cope with those of any enemy, or if after the construction of the canal we are to remain in danger of its obstruction by seizure or injury at the very time when its free passage might mean our national life or death.

Let me in closing again urge that this is our canal, constructed at our expense, to be maintained by the United States alone; that it is constructed as a great instrumentality of national protection and safety; that its safeguarding is a national duty which we dare not shirk, no matter what the cost; that the best guaranty of its neutrality is its protection from all danger; that the nations of the earth have our promise of its safe passage to the ships of the world upon equal terms: that its guns, mounted to command either entrance, will not frown upon the peace of the world, will not be a menace to any other power, but will welcome with thunderous salutation every vessel of every flag which does not come into our waters as an enemy of the United States. [Loud applause.]

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move that

the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Tilson, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the District of Columbia appropriation bill (H. R. 31856), and had come to no resolution thereon.

EXHIBITS OF ART, SCIENCES, AND INDUSTRIES.

Mr. DALZELL, from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported the bill (H. R. 30281) to provide for the entry in bond of exhibits of art, sciences, and industries, which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report (No. 1990), ordered to be printed.

LEAVE TO WITHDRAW PAPERS-ROBERT M. ROSE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. Hughes of Georgia was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Robert M. Rose, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

EULOGIES ON THE LATE SENATOR HUGHES.

By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. Taylor of Colorado, it was-

Ordered, That on Sunday, February 12, 1911, the delivery of eulogies on the life, character, and public services of the Hon. Charles James Hughes, Jr., late a Senator of the United States from Colorado, shall be in order. HUGHES, Jr. be in order.

FORTIFICATION OF PANAMA CANAL-SPEECH OF THE FRESIDENT. Mr. AUSTIN. I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the speech of the President of the United States, delivered in New York last Saturday night, on the question of fortifying the Panama Canal.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Austin] asks unanimous consent to print in the Record a speech made by the President of the United States last Saturday night in the city of New York on the subject of the fortification of the Panama Canal. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The speech referred to is as follows:

ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT WILLIAM H. TAFT AT THE DINNER OF THE PENN-SYLVANIA SOCIETY, HOTEL ASTOR, NEW YORK CITY, JANUARY 21, 1911.

Gentlemen of the Pennsylvania Society:

Gentlemen of the Pennsylvania Society:

I am glad to be here and am glad to know that so much of the energy, the enterprise, and the intelligence of New York has been contributed by the sons of William Penn. William Penn was in favor of peace. So, too, are the men of Pennsylvania. But I assume that they are practical men who do not lose sight of facts and existing conditions in an ecstasy of hope and Utopian enthusiasm.

I am going to invite your attention to the question now pending in Congress as to whether the Panama Canal ought to be fortified. I can not think that any careful person will read the record of historical facts, treaties, and acts of Congress, and diplomatic negotiations without conceding the full right of the United States to fortify the canal. But memories are short, records are not always at hand, and without in the slightest degree conceding that the existence of the full right of the United States to fortify her own property on the Isthmus is in the slightest doubt, I venture, before considering the question of the policy of fortifying the canal, to refer to the history which makes the right incontestable.

In 1850 we made the Clayton-Bulwer treaty with England, which

Into the nightness degree conceding that the existence of the full visions in the nightness degree conceding that the existence of the full vision in the nightness degree conceding that the existence of the full vision in the nightness death of the silchiest doubt, I venture, before considering the question of the policy of fortifying the canal, to refer to the history which makes the right incontestable.

In 1850 was made the Clayton-Bulwer treaty with England, which the canal was to be built, and we would neither of us fort than the contracting parties, and probably by private enterprise, across Central America or the Isthmus of Panama. By that treaty we agreed with England that we would neither of us fortify it, and we would neither of us fortify it, and we would untie of the nations to become parties to the agreement. The canal was no be built, and we would neither of us for the nations to become parties to the agreement. The canal was no built under that treaty. The French attempted it and failed. We had a Spanish war. The cruise of the Oregon of 12,000 miles along the seacoast of two continents, from San Francisco to Cuba, at a time when the seat of war was in the venture subject us to humiliating defeat. This lesson brought about the effort to modify the Clayton-Bulwer treaty for the very purpose of the oregon and the property of the continuous parties of the oregon of 12,000 miles along the sealed of the parties of the treaty of 1850 under other conditions. The correspondence between Lord Lansdowne and Mr. Hay, as well as Mr. Hay's state-traiting the power to fortify the canal which it had parted with in the treaty of 1850 under other conditions. The correspondence between Lord Lansdowne and Mr. Hay, as well as Mr. Hay's state-traiting the canal was to be built, to construct the canal itself, and to regain the power to fortify the canal which it had parted with in the treaty of 1850 under other conditions. The correspondence between Lord Lansdowne and Mr. Hay, as well as Mr. Hay's state-traiting the pow

other country that is not bound to us by treaty rights at all, is not it essential that we should have fortifications there to protect the canal, not only for our own use and for the world's commerce, but for the use of England and her warships as a means of passage? In other words, we have to preserve that canal as a means of transit to belligerents in time of war as long as we are ourselves not engaged in the controversy.

words, we have to preserve that cann't as a means of transit to belligerents in time of war as long as we are ourselves not engaged in the controversy.

But it is said that we could induce all the powers to come in and consent to the neutrality of the canal as a treaty obligation. I should be glad to do this if possible; but even if we do this, can we feel entirely safe by reason of that agreement from a possible injury to the canal by some irresponsible beligerent, at least under conditions as they now are?

Then it is said that the fortifications are going to cost \$50,000,000. This is an error. The estimated cost of the fortifications for the canal is \$12,000,000. That, I submit, constitutes hardly more than 2 per cent of the cost of the canal—a first premium for insuring its safety that is not excessive.

It is also said that it will cost \$5,000,000 a year to maintain them. This is also an error. I have consulted the War Department, and they advise me that the addition to the annual Government cost of maintenance of fortifications and military establishment in time of peace due to the fortifications of the canal would not exceed half a million dollars—an annual insurance rate after first cost of a tenth of 1 per cent.

to the fortifications of the canal would not exceed half a million dollars—an annual insurance rate after first cost of a tenth of 1 per cent.

The case of the Suez Canal furnishes no analogy whatever. In the first place, the Suez Canal is nothing but a ditch in a desert, incapable of destruction, and even when obstructed it can be cleared within a very short time. The Panama Canal, by the destruction of the gate locks, could be put out of commission for two years, and the whole commerce of the world made to suffer therefrom.

Again, the land through which the Suez Canal runs is not in the jurisdiction of England or of any one of the five great powers. Many nations partake in the ownership of the canal, and it is not within the control of any single nation. The circumstances under which the Panama Canal has been building, the ownership of the strip, and one of the main purposes for which it was constructed, are very different and make it exactly as if it were a canal cut through the narrow part of Florida. It is on American soil and under American control, and it needs our fortifications for national defense just as much as the city of New York needs fortifications, and there is the additional reason that we ought to have them in order to perform our international obligations.

I yield to no one in my love of peace, in my hatred of war, and in my earnest desire to avoid war. I believe that we have made great strides toward peace within the last decade. No one that I know of goes further in favor of settling international controversies by arbitration than I do, and if I have my way and am able to secure the assent of other powers, I shall submit to the Senate arbitration treaties broader in their terms than any that body has heretofore ratified, and broader than any that now exist between the nations. In laying down my office, I could leave no greater claim to the gratitude of my countrymen than to have secured such treaties. But I can not permit myself in the enthusiastic desire to secure universal peace to bli

#### CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE-PARSONS V. SAUNDERS.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the contested-election case of Parsons v. Saunders recommitted to Committee on Elections No. 2.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that the contested-election case of Parsons v. Saunders be recommitted to Committee on Elections No. 2. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 25, 1911, at 12 o'clock noon.

# EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for a memorial arch at Valley Forge, Pa. (H. Doc. No. 1312); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for Freedmen's Hospital and Howard University (H. Doc. No. 1313); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting report of Commercial Agent James D. Whelpley on

trade development in Argentina (S. Doc. No. 781); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be

4. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, transmitting a statement of expenditures in the Coast and Geodetic Survey for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1910 (H. Doc. No. 1314); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and Labor and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named as follows:

Mr. VOLSTEAD, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 29164) to accept the cession by the State of Washington of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Mount Rainier National Park, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1978), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred House bills 26232, 28433, 30288, and 31162, reported in lieu thereof a bill (H. R. 32010) to create a tariff board, accompanied by a report (No. 1979), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on

the state of the Union.

Mr. RODENBERG, from the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 29362) to provide for celebrating the completion and opening of the Panama Canal by the United States by holding an international exposition of arts, industries, manufactures, and the products of the soil, mines, forest, and sea, in the city of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1989), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota, from the Committee on Inter-

state and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 29714) to amend an act entitled "An act permitting the building of a dam across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Sauk Rapids, Benton County, Minn.," approved February 26, 1904, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1980), which said bill

and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HUBBARD of West Virginia, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 31922) to authorize the Virginia Iron, Coal & Coke Co. to build a dam across the New River near Foster Falls, Wythe County, Va., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1981), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ADAMSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 31925) authorizing the building of a dam across the Savannah River at Cherokee Shoals, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1982), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ESCH, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 31926) permitting the building of a dam across Rock River near Byron, Ill., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1983), which said bill and report

were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 31927) authorizing the town of Blackberry to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River in Itasca County, Minn., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1984), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 31928) to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the Tombigbee River near Iron Wood Bluff, in Itawamba County, Miss., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1985), which said

bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 31929) to extend the time for the completion of the dam across the Choctawhatchee River in Dale County, Ala., by A. J. Smith and his associates, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1986), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TOWNSEND, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 31930) granting to Herman L. Hartenstein the right to construct a dam across the St. Joseph River near Mottville, St. Joseph County, Mich., reported the same without amend-ment, accompanied by a report (No. 1987), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HUBBARD of West Virginia, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 31931) authorizing the Ivanhoe Furnace Corporation, of Ivanhoe, Wythe County, Va., to erect a dam across New River, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1988), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 18941) granting an increase of pension to Willard D. Cook; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 31988) granting an increase of pension to Malinda Peak; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 21977) granting a pension to Austin L. Straub; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 28775) granting a pension to Chas. J. Pfahl; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 31789) granting a pension to George Linehos; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. OLMSTED: A bill (H. R. 32004) providing for the

quadrennial election of members of the Philippine Assembly and Resident Commissioners to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 32005) to incorporate the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on Military

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 32006) for reduction of customs duties on pharmaceutical and bacteriological products, surgical instruments, and such instruments and apparatus as are used by physicians; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOULDEN; A bill (H. R. 32007) to amend section 657 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia; to the

Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 32008) to enable the Secretary of the Interior to purchase the fire-alarm system appliances, apparatus, and connections now and heretofore placed in the Government buildings of the Government Hospital for the Insane, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appro-

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 32009) to authorthe Department of Agriculture to make a dry-farming exhibit and appropriate money therefor; to the Committee on

By Mr. ESTOPINAL: Resolution (H. Res. 929) setting a time

to consider H. R. 29362; to the Committee on Rules. By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. modifying certain laws relating to the military records of certain soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions

were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AMES: A bill (H. R. 32011) granting an increase of pension to Kirk F. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pen-

Also, a bill (H. R. 32012) granting an increase of pension to Lucy W. Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32013) granting an increase of pension to Frank E. Moore; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 32014) granting an increase of pension to William Gilbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions,

Also, a bill (H. R. 32015) granting an increase of pension to Fred Groch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32016) granting a pension to Ann Eliza

Dumble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: A bill (H. R. 32017) granting an increase of pension to William Henry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32018) granting an increase of pension to Hugh H. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 32019) granting a pension to Maidora C. Parker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 32020) granting an increase of pension to Ambrose P. Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32021) granting an increase of pension to Edward Hearin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 32022) granting a pension to Samuel R. McDowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 32023) for the relief of Thomas F. Kelley; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COCKS of New York: A bill (H. R. 32024) granting an increase of pension to Mathew McKnight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 32025) granting a pension to Catherine Greene; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DODDS: A bill (H. R. 32026) granting an increase of pension to James O'Conner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 32027) granting a pension to Sarah J. Gould; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 32028) to correct the military record of Charles D. Morse; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 32029) granting a pension to

Emma Burrows; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 32030) to correct the military record of Augustus York; to the Committee on Mili-

By Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 32031) granting a pension to John A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pen-

By Mr. FOSTER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 32032) granting a pension to Allen Byers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. By Mr. GRANT: A bill (H. R. 32033) granting an increase of pension to Edw. P. Burnett; to the Committee on Invalid

Pensions.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 32034) granting an increase of pension to John Rooney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOBSON: A bill (H. R. 32035) granting a pension to

Elza L. Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 32036) for the relief of the estate of Samuel A. Spencer; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32037) granting an increase of pension to

John H. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 32038) granting a pension to Rebecca Cordell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions

By Mr. McCREDIE: A bill (H. R. 32039) granting an increase of pension to Otho W. Thompson; to the Committee on

Invalid Pensions. By Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 32040) granting an increase of pension to Wallace R. Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32041) granting an increase of pension to L. B. Nichols; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32042) granting an increase of pension to Oliver T. Tripp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32043) for the relief of William Macaw; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McHENRY: A bill (H. R. 32044) granting a pension to William K. Wertman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 32045) granting a pension to Jennie L. Comstock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32046) granting an increase of pension to Maria A. Van Kleek; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. By Mr. MASSEY: A bill (H. R. 32047) for the relief of Eli

Helton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAYS: A bill (H. R. 32048) for the relief of A. Purdee; to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

By Mr. NORRIS: A bill (H. R. 32049) granting an increase pension to George Ditzel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 32050) granting a pension to Charles W. Fowler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32051) granting an increase of pension to William H. Bell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 32052) for the relief of James Devore; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PICKETT: A bill (H. R. 32053) granting an increase of pension to Jesse M. Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 32054) granting an increase of pension to Robert Henderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32055) granting an increase of pension to George W. Lyons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. By Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 32056) grant-

ing a pension to William H. Jones; to the Committee on Pen-

Also, a bill (H. R. 32057) granting an increase of pension to Nard B. R. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pen-

Also, a bill (H. R. 32058) granting an increase of pension to R. H. Robertson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32059) granting an increase of pension to John W. Weaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32060) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Clack; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32061) granting an increase of pension to James Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32062) granting an increase of pension to Isaac T. Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32063) granting an increase of pension to William Webb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32064) granting an increase of pension to John T. Murray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32065) granting an increase of pension to William H. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32066) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Travis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32067) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Phifer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32068) granting an increase of pension to John A. Cole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32069) granting an increase of pension to Granville Corley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32070) granting an increase of pension to C. M. Hildebrand; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32071) granting an increase of pension to John W. Gillum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 32072) to reimburse Carl F. Kolbe; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32073) granting an increase of pension to Henry J. Shook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEEKS: A bill (H. R. 32074) to correct the military record of John D. Grose; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32075) for the relief of Andrew H. Russell and William R. Livermore; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEISSE: A bill (H. R. 32076) granting a pension to Elizabeth Criddle; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 32077) granting an increase of pension to John R. Fugill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of Legislature of Porto Rico, against legislation increasing limit of agricultural corporations; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of Legislature of Nevada, favoring San Francisco as site of Panama Exposition; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER of New York: Petition of National Board of Trade, for House bill 14622 and Senate bill 4982, to establish a court of patent appeals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition of Charles Kuntz & Co., of Continental, Ohio, against rural parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Glad Hand Class, Seventh Street Christian Church, of Coshocton, Ohio, against proposed increase on second-class mail matter and in favor of the Carter-Weeks bill: to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Hugh H. Wilson and William Henry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARNHART: Petition of citizens of North Liberty, Ind., against a parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post

Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Goshen (Ind.) Union of Painters and Decorators, for repeal of the oleomargarine tax law; to the Com-

mittee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURLESON: Petition of International Association of Car Workers' Lodge No. 50, of Clearfield, Pa.; Cigar Makers' Union No. 205, of Battle Creek, Mich.; Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, Local No. 1006, of New York; Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of Goshen, Ind.; Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America of Valley Junction, Ohio; Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen of Two Harbors, Minn.; International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths and Helpers' Union of Chicago, Ill.; Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America of Evanston, Ill.; V. B. Smith, United Trades and Labor Assembly, of Louisville, Ky.; and Fort Houston Lodge of International Association of Mechanics, of Palestine, Tex., for repeal of tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Leonard Eck, J. W. Combs, S. W. Stewart,

and others, against a rural parcels post; to the Committee on

the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BYRNS: Memorial of Legislature of Tennessee, for New Orleans as site of Panama Exposition; to the Committee on

Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of F. Harbridge Co., of Racine; H. A. Hickok, of Belmont; Stiles & Rogers and other residents of Beloit; John Brinkman, of Alton, all in the State of Wisconsin, against parcels-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DAWSON: Petition of W. D. Harris and 11 other citizens of Wilton Junction, Iowa, against a rural parcels post;

to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DIEKEMA: Petition of Alden & Judson and others, against the establishment of a local rural parcels-post service on the rural delivery routes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DODDS: Petition of W. P. Mosher and others, of Bellaire, Mich., for the Miller-Curtis bill, H. R. 23641; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DRAPER: Memorial of the Walla Walla Trades and Labor Council, relating to the disposition of the cavalry post at Fort Walla Walla, in Washington; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Petition of Canners' League of California, for amendment to the pure-food act providing name of maker to be on packages; to the Committee on Agri-

Also, petition of J. M. Schuler and others, of Sisson, Cal., against the parcels-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Eureka, Cal., against extension of parcels-post service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ELLIS: Memorial of Oretown (Oreg.) Grange, No. 354, for parcels-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ESCH: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Emma Burrows; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas: Paper to accompany bill for

relief of John A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORNES: Petition of Southern California Homeopathic Medical Society, against the Owen health-department bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a petition of Stephen Tarrelly, for House bill 30888, for the purchase of embassy buildings abroad; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Frank J. Martin, indorsing New Orleans as site for the Panama Exposition; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

Also, petition of A. Sebring and others, for battleship construction at the Brooklyn Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of B. C. Stewart and others, of Gardner, Ill., against a parcels-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of J. F. Reardon, of Manitowoc, Wis., for bill (H. R. 17883) to increase pension of those who lost an arm or leg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Barnes Drill Co., Rockford, Ill., for San Francisco as site for Panama Exposition; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

Also, petition of Harry Masean, of Rockford, Ill., for militia bill (H. R. 28436); to the Committee on the Militia.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petition of George H. Andrews, of Winnebago, Minn., against a parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of N. Kleinyan and 25 others, of Trosky, Minn., against removal of duty on barley; to the Committee on Ways

and Means.

Also, petition of Lorn Gray and 84 others, of Mankato, Minn., for San Francisco as site of Panama Exposition; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of Charles L. Rouse & Co. and others, of North Dakota, against a parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Enderlin, N. Dak., for an eighthour day for post-office clerks as per the Jones-Poindexter bills; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of North Dakota, for the Hanna bill (H. R. 26791) providing additional compensation to rural free deliverers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Twelfth Legislative Assembly of North Dakota, favoring Senate bill 6842; to the Committee on the Public

By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition of citizens of the first congressional district of Oregon, against parcels-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Thlinket Packing Co., Portland, Oreg., against Delegate Wickersham's fisheries bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Petition of O. O. McWilliams, of Speidel, Ohio, against parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. JOYCE: Petition of H. B. Vincent and others, against local rural parcels-post service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: Petition of citizens of the sixth congressional district and Greeley County, Nebr., against parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Petition of surviving members of Company Twenty-sixth Pennsylvania Regiment, for the passage of the Rayner pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions,

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition by citizens of Pillager, Minn., protesting against the enactment into law by Congress of the parcels post recommendation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LOWDEN: Petition of citizens of the thirteenth Illinois congressional district, against a parcels-post law; to the

Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the First Baptist Church of Paw Paw, Ill., for House bill 23641, the Miller-Curtis bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McHENRY: Petition of Watsontown Council of the Junior Order United American Mechanics, for more stringent laws relative to immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of business men of Weeping Water and Pawnee City, Nebr., against a local rural parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: Petitions of L. Beach, S. W. Strange, C. W. Myers, A. E. Girdner, C. C. Share, A. M. De Bolt, Strange, C. W. Myers, A. E. Gitcher, C. C. Share, A. M. De Bolt, F. C. Staley & Co., B. Z. Hutchinson, A. D. Dailey, Ed. Hockaday & Co., J. H. Sneed, A. Sneed, and others, of the second congressional district of Oklahoma, protesting against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PLUMLEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Carl H. Ellis (previously referred to the Committee on Invalid

Pensions); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POINDEXTER: Petition of A. B. Reading, of Auburn, Cal., to abolish certain corporations by amendment of the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRAY: Petition of 70 merchants and others of Harlem, Lewistown, Belfray, Gildford, and Big Fork, in the State of Montana, against parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SHEFFIELD: Memorial of City Council of Pawtucket, R. I., for increasing efficiency of the Life-Saving Service by retirement of members; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Petition of citizens of San Antonio, Tex., against rural parcels-post service; to the Committee on the

Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STERLING: Petition of J. W. Perryman and others, of Clinton, and M. Heard and others and members of the Baptist Church of Thompsonville, in the State of Illinois, for House bill 23641, the Miller-Curtis bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of H. C. Hawes and others, against parcels-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. THISTLEWOOD: Petition of citizens of the twentycongressional district of Illinois, against a parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. THOMAS of Ohio: Petition of citizens of the nineteenth congressional district of Ohio, against a rural parcelspost system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post

By Mr. WALLACE: Petition of citizens of the seventh congressional district of Arkansas, against parcels-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WEISSE: Petition of many citizens of the sixth congressional district of Wiscensin, against a parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of many citizens of sixth congressional district of Wisconsin, asking for a parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John R. Fugill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## SENATE.

# Wednesday, January 25, 1911.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D. The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved. SENATOR FROM UTAH.

Mr. SMOOT presented the credentials of George Sutherland, chosen by the Legislature of Utah a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1911, which were read and ordered to be filed.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by W. J. Browning, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (H. R. 31539) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 1.

the honorable Senators and Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:
Your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respect-

Your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represents that—
Whereas a resolution is now pending in the Senate of the United States proposing to submit to the several States of the Union an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that Members of the United States Senate shall be elected by the direct vote of the people of their respective States instead of the legislatures, as is now provided: Therefore
Your said memorialist earnestly recommends the passage of said resolution, and represents that the State of Idaho desires the submission of such amendment to the various States for ratification at an early date.
The secretary of state of the State of Idaho is hereby instructed to forward this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and copies of the same to our Senators and Representative in Congress.

The above senate joint memorial No. 1 passed the senate on the 16th day of January, 1911.

The above senate joint memorial No. 1 passed the house of representatives on the 17th day of January, 1911.

Charles D. Storey,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I hereby certify that the above senate joint memorial No. 1 originated in the senate during the eleventh session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

CHAS. W. DEMPSTER, Secretary of the Senate.

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, W. L. Gifford, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of senate Joint memorial No. 1, by Freehafer, relating to the election of United States Senators by the direct vote of the people.

Passed the senate January 16, 1911.

Passed the house January 17, 1911.

Which was filed in this office the 19th day of January, A. D. 1911, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State.

Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 20th day of January, A. D. 1911.

[SEAL.]

W. L. GIFFORD, Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a petition of the congregation of the Second Congregational Church of Oak Park, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the traffic in opium and cocaine, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the petition of A. L. Griffith, of Pell City, Ala., praying for the passage of the so-called old-age pension

bill, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. JONES. I present a telegram from a committee of the house of representatives of the Legislature of the State of Washington, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

There being no objection, the telegram was read and referred to the Committee on Pensions, as follows:

OLYMPIA, WASH., January 24, 1911.

Senator Jones, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Stand by the Sulloway bill as it passed the House.

Sed the House.

OLIVER BYERLY,
F. H. LESOURD,
NELSON RICH,
GEORGE F. WARD,
Committee on Soldiers' Home.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I present a telegram from the senate of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be

printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. COE I. CRAWFORD, Washington, D. C .:

Hon. Coe I. Crawford, Washington, D. C.:

The following resolution has been unanimously adopted by the senate:
"Be it resolved, That for the good of the public and the postal service and for the proper adjustment of the present difficulty, we request an investigation be had of the conditions and postal service of rallway postal district No. 10, and the secretary of the senate be instructed to wire same to representatives in United States Congress."

And your consideration is respectfully requested.

GEO. O. VAN CAMP,

Secretary of Senate.

Mr. BURNHAM presented sundry telegrams in the nature of petitions of Gilman E. Sleeper Post, of Haverhill; of Almon B. White Post, of White River Junction; of Major Jarvis Post, of Claremont; of Post No. 17, of Dover; of Fred Smyth Post, No. 10, of Newport; and of Post No. 73, of Mountain View, Department of New Hampshire, Grand Army of the Republic; and of sundry veterans of the Civil War, of Portsmouth, all in the State of New Hampshire, praying for the passage of the so-called old-age pension bill, which were referred to the Committee or Portsmouth. mittee on Pensions.

Mr. FLINT presented a petition of the Reading Club of Pacific Beach, Cal., praying for the repeal of the present oleo-margarine law, which was referred to the Committee on Agri-

culture and Forestry.

Mr. KEAN presented a petition of the Monday Afternoon Club, of Passaic, N. J., praying that an investigation be made into the condition of dairy products for the prevention and spread of tuberculosis, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented the petition of Edward Q. Keasbey, of Newark, N. J., and a petition of the New Jersey State Fed-eration of Women's Clubs, praying for the passage of the socalled children's bureau bill, which were ordered to lie on the

He also presented the memorial of H. M. Dutcher, of Camden, N. J., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation proposing to change the name of the Marine-Hospital Service, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

He also presented the petition of E. A. Goodell, of Arlington, N. J., and the petition of M. Williams, of Orange, N. J., praying for the passage of the so-called old-age pension bill, which were

referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of the Christian Science Society of Hoboken, N. J., remonstrating against the establishment of a national department of health, which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quar-

He also presented a memorial of the American Federation of Catholic Societies, of St. Louis, Mo., remonstrating against any appropriation being made for the extension of the work of